

# ***The*** --- ***Non-Aligned*** --- ***Movement***









*To the Memory of Indira Gandhi, who was  
killed while Chairman of the non-aligned  
movement*



# ***The Non-Aligned Movement***

Editors:

I. I. Kovalenko

Professor (P. Lumumba People's  
Friendship University)

R. A. Tuzmukhamedov

Professor (Institute  
of State and Law,  
USSR Academy of Sciences)



*Progress  
Publishers  
Moscow*

Translated from the Russian by *Margaret Webley*  
Designed by *G. N. Gubanov*

## ДВИЖЕНИЕ НЕПРИСОЕДИНЕНИЯ

Под редакцией И. И. Коваленко и Р. А. Тузмухамедова

*На английском языке*

Authors:

Ch. 1—I. I. Kovalenko

Ch. 2—R. A. Tuzmukhamedov

Ch. 3—G. F. Kim

Ch. 4—V. F. Petrovsky,  
A. B. Kozyrev

Ch. 5—~~И. И.~~ R. A. Tuzmukhamedov

Ch. 6—I. D. Ivanov

Ch. 7—G. B. Starushenko

Ch. 8—Yu. B. Kashlev

Ch. 9—Ya. Ya. Etinger

Ch. 10—V. A. Kreminyuk

Ch. 11—A. V. Sergiyev,  
L. B. Teplinsky

Ch. 12—R. A. Tuzmukha-  
medov

Ch. 13—R. A. Tuzmukha-  
medov

Conclusion—I. I. Kovalenko

© Издательство “Наука”, 1985

English translation of the revised Russian text

© Progress Publishers 1988

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

Д  $\frac{0801000000 - 088}{014 (01) - 88}$  48 - 88

ISBN 5-01-000488-7

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	7
<i>Chapter 1</i>	
Emergence, Essence and Development of the Non-Aligned Movement .....	9
<i>Chapter 2</i>	
Peaceful Co-existence and the Political and Legal Basis of the Non-Aligned Movement .....	36
<i>Chapter 3</i>	
Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Colonialism—the Main Direction of the Non-Aligned Movement .....	55
<i>Chapter 4</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement—an Important Factor in the Struggle for International Security and Curbing the Arms Race .....	77
<i>Chapter 5</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement and Zones of Peace .....	97
<i>Chapter 6</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement and Restructuring of International Economic Relations .....	117
<i>Chapter 7</i>	
Non-Aligned Countries Against Racism and Racial Discrimination .....	148
<i>Chapter 8</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement Against “Information Imperialism” .....	161

<i>Chapter 9</i>	
The Ideological Struggle Around the Concept of Non-Aligned movement . . . . .	181
<i>Chapter 10</i>	
Imperialist Subversion of the Non-Aligned Movement . . . . .	199
<i>Chapter 11</i>	
Socialist Countries and the Non-Aligned Movement . . . . .	219
<i>Chapter 12</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement and International Organisations of Emergent States . . . . .	235
<i>Chapter 13</i>	
The Non-Aligned Movement and International Law . . . . .	249
Conclusion . . . . .	276

## Introduction

The birth of the non-aligned movement was one of the most important outcomes of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system. The passionate ideological and political call for unity of the emergent states made in 1946 by Jawaharlal Nehru, that great son of India, was heard in the liberated world and taken up by millions of people who had been freed from colonial slavery.

In the favourable post-war conditions that saw a weakening of imperialism, greater authority of world socialism and successes of the peoples' national liberation struggle, the movement rapidly strengthened and became a powerful factor of world politics. In the 26 years since the first meeting of the initial non-aligned countries in 1961, the movement's membership has increased five-fold and now numbers over 100. A new progressive factor has appeared in international relations that exerts a positive impact on all aspects of world politics.

The non-aligned movement came about as a manifestation of the young states' desire to consolidate their political and achieve economic independence, and to assert their right to equal participation in international affairs.

Arising out of the debris of the imperialist colonial system, the non-aligned movement was, in effect, the continuation of the peoples' national liberation struggle in the new situation in which imperialism could not exercise its domination using the old colonial methods and could not keep them in the sphere of its political and economic influence by employing military brute force. The non-aligned movement was a distinctive self-expression by the emergent states, a tool for strengthening their national, political and economic independence. It became a powerful weapon in the struggle to consolidate their independence, involvement in

the world community of nations and active participation in resolving global problems.

The Soviet Union welcomed the appearance of the movement from the outset. And today it is prepared to actively cooperate with it to resolve the urgent problems of today. The USSR saw the results of the 1986 Harare conference as a major success on the part of the movement, the CPSU Political Bureau noting that the forum had confirmed yet again that the non-aligned movement is an influential international force which is strengthening the developing countries' political and economic independence and making a big contribution to the effort to achieve peace, curb the arms race, and combat imperialism, colonialism and racism.<sup>1</sup>

By contrast, imperialism and reaction see the non-aligned movement as a major roadblock to establishment of their world domination, and do their utmost to undermine and weaken the movement using the basest and most inhuman means.

The whole world was shaken by the imperialist hirelings' brutal murder of Indira Gandhi, Chairman of the non-aligned movement and outstanding daughter of the Indian people who followed in her father's footsteps to develop and strengthen the movement on its progressive basis.

There is enormous interest in the non-aligned movement and voluminous literature has been written about it. While the authors connected with the imperialist quarters try to discredit the movement, in the socialist world and the non-aligned countries themselves there is a growing number of various publications, including scientific studies, which show the movement's successes, make an objective analysis of its difficulties, and deal with the prospects for its development.

In the Soviet Union, the documents of the movement's summit conferences and Foreign Ministers conferences up to 1981 have been translated and published, and a number of monographic and collective studies have been put out.

This book sums up, as it were, the Soviet Union's research and publicist activity on this highly relevant topic up to the mid-1980s. Its authors are not only eminent scholars but also work at Soviet foreign policy departments and organisations, each being well-known as an expert on the respective aspect of the non-aligned movement.

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 27 October, 1986.



## Chapter 1

### Emergence, Essence and Development of the Non-Aligned Movement

The non-aligned movement is a product of the contemporary epoch. Like all social and political movements, it resulted from the previous course of historical development and a series of major world events, which is why a correct understanding of the essence of non-alignment and its ideological sources necessitates a historical approach to this international phenomenon.

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in mankind's development. It struck a crushing blow against imperialism by opening a real road for the national liberation and social emancipation of the oppressed peoples. As Lenin had predicted, the experience of the October revolution in a country like Russia showed the peoples of the East that "weak as they may be, and invincible as may seem the power of the European oppressors, who in the struggle employ all the marvels of technology and of the military art—nevertheless, a revolutionary war waged by oppressed peoples, if it really succeeds in arousing the millions of working and exploited people, harbours such potentialities, such miracles, that the emancipation of the peoples of the East is now quite practicable...".<sup>1</sup>

The October Revolution's ideas of liberation spread like lightning among the oppressed peoples of the East, aroused the consciousness of the disinherited masses of the colonial world, and stirred them to struggle for their liberation. The victory of the October Revolution united the socialist and national liberation revolutions and offered the oppressed peoples the prospect of national liberation and the creation of independent and equal states on the debris

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 153-154.

of the colonial empires.

The second event that had an enormous ideological and political impact on contemporary world development was the formation of the world socialist community, which divided the world into two opposing systems.

The Second World War drew broad masses from Asia, Africa and Latin America into the struggle against Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism, putting them through the hard school of political education and bringing them into contact with the lofty ideals of struggle for freedom and national independence.

For that reason, the liquidation of world reaction's strike forces—Hitler's Germany and imperialist Japan—radically altered the international balance of forces. In Eastern Europe, a number of states broke away from the world capitalist system following the victory of people's democratic revolutions. Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia chose the way of socialist transformations. Next came three countries in Asia: the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the People's Republic of China. Along with the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic, and later the Socialist Republic of Cuba, and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, those countries of Europe and Asia formed the world socialist system, which began to exert a decisive influence on world events and gave a powerful impetus to the further upsurge of the national liberation movement by adding fresh force and dynamism to it. It was the formation of the world system of socialism that placed obstacles in the way of the imperialist states' colonial plunder and forced them to heed the demands of the colonial and dependent peoples fighting for their freedom and national independence.

The third, equally important, event which is closely connected with the first two was the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism under the onslaught of the oppressed peoples. The great national liberation movement of the colonial and dependent countries caused a gigantic re-alignment of forces internationally in favour of peace, democracy and social progress, dealt a crushing blow against imperialism resulting in the weakening of its political, economic and military might, and facilitated the establishment of a

new system of international relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, equal cooperation and non-interference in internal affairs. Scores of countries which the imperialists had kept outside of world politics began actively to participate in it. Suffice it to say that today almost three-quarters of the seats in the United Nations and its specialised agencies belong to countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As Lenin foresaw, a new period in world history has started, "a period in which all the Eastern peoples will participate in deciding the destiny of the whole world".<sup>1</sup>

As to its historical significance, the liquidation of the colonial system of imperialism was rightly described by the 1969 international forum of Communists as a phenomenon second only to the formation of the world socialist system.

However, the imperialists could not reconcile themselves to the loss of their colonial possessions and withdraw from them without a fight. They have been trying desperately to preserve the old and to seize new positions in the ex-colonies. Claiming that they are combating "the communist menace", the imperialist powers are seeking to return to the liberated countries as "defenders" of their sovereignty and to place their puppets in power.

To those same ends they began to knock together aggressive military blocs and bilateral military alliances, relying on the assistance and support of the reactionary circles among the local exploiting classes. Primary among these aggressive blocs was the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) or the Manila Pact. At that time the Pact included the USA, Britain and France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan, meaning that only three Asian countries were actually a part of the pact, the other countries being located far beyond the Asian continent. Large countries of Asia like India and Indonesia, and also Burma and Ceylon refused to participate in this openly aggressive military and political bloc.

The Baghdad Pact was created to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples of Western Asia and the Arab East. Following the national democratic revolution in Iraq and that country's withdrawal, it was renamed CENTO—the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 160.

## Central Treaty Organisation.

Later came the secret aggressive ASPAC (Asian and Pacific Council) bloc, which included, together with other countries imperialist Japan. Even before these blocs were set up, a grouping called ANZUS had been formed in the Pacific Ocean. It comprised the USA, Australia and New Zealand and pursues an active imperialist policy in that region to this day.

The system of blocs established in Asia and the Middle East was supplemented by blocs and military bases set up and built on other continents and on the vast expanses of the Pacific and Indian oceans. The national liberation movement in Latin America and the Caribbean encounters the opposition of the Organisation of American States (OAS), whose flag covers the USA's neo-colonialist policy in Latin America.

Opposing the Baghdad Pact, Nasser gave an eloquent assessment of the imperialist blocs: "Arabs want to have nothing to do with the large prison that the imperialist powers are setting up to meet their objectives. At first this imperialist prison took the form of domination by the imperialist forces themselves, then imperialism's prison took the new form of treaties and alliances. The Baghdad Pact is the latest form of the imperialist prison. The Arabs have seen that the new pact is a large prison and they naturally do not want to enter it voluntarily."

Realistically-minded leaders of capitalist countries also understood that the policy of military blocs is ineffective and felt that it should be replaced by a policy of aid to the developing countries. American political figure Adlai Stevenson wrote in 1957 that the US attempts to justify a policy of knocking together military blocs in Asia with a mythical "communist menace" was increasingly being shown to be groundless and that most US activity was taking the form of military threats, military pacts and military aid. "We have persisted in construing the Communist threat to the underdeveloped world as essentially military. For people hungering after economic growth, we offer SEATO and place a defense effort ahead of the struggle against poverty. For people hungering after national independence we offer little more than a policy of insensitive arrogance."<sup>1</sup>

Taking on the functions of a world police force, between

<sup>1</sup> Adlai E. Stevenson, *The New America*, Rupert Hart-Davis, London, p. 23.

1958 and 1966 American imperialism used its armed forces 157 times to interfere openly in the internal affairs of sovereign states. For three years American imperialism waged a bloody war under the UN flag against the Korean people in an effort to destroy the Korean People's Democratic Republic and set up a puppet regime. The US waged a protracted and cruel war against the heroic Vietnamese people, and brazenly invaded and carried out numerous armed acts against revolutionary Cuba. It has been conducting an undeclared war against Nicaragua and El Salvador, and carried out overt aggression against Grenada, overthrowing the progressive regime and restoring the colonial order. The American aggressors have carried out military actions against other peoples of Latin America, and gave Britain considerable assistance in the seizure of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, which belong to Argentina.

American armed forces have been conducting open military actions in the Middle East. Their direct participation in the aggression against Lebanon, the attempts to invade Iran, and the boundless support for the Israeli aggressors against the Arab peoples show that US imperialism intends to hold on to its plans to establish its domination over many independent countries and peoples and is prepared to resort to any means to prevent those peoples who are still under the colonial yoke from attaining freedom and independence.

In order to beat back imperialism's latest attack and preserve and consolidate their freedom and independence, these countries began to seek new forms of opposition to imperialism, to old and new colonialism. The emergent states understood that they could not withstand imperialism's military and political blackmail in isolation and began to seek collective forms of rebuffing imperialist pressure and the Western powers' neo-colonialist aspirations.

Even at the stage of struggle for independence, colonial and dependent countries put forward various forms of coordinating efforts on the international arena. Thus, in 1945 Ho Chi Minh, President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and outstanding leader of the international communist and national liberation movements, proposed to the Indonesian government that they adopt a joint declaration on a pooling of efforts by both states in the fight against

colonialism, and also that a preparatory commission be set up to establish cooperation between Southeast Asian countries.

General Aung San, outstanding leader of the Burmese national liberation movement and founder of the Burmese state, supported the creation of a single anti-imperialist Asian front. In January 1947 he proposed that an Asian Community be set up to protect the independence of the young national states, and that the Southeast Asian countries form an economic union.

Jawaharlal Nehru, that great son of the Indian people, did much to unite Asian states. It was he who initiated the First Asian Relations Conference, which took place in Delhi in March and April 1947 and was attended by representatives of the public from 27 Asian countries, including the Central Asian and Transcaucasian Soviet republics, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and also observers from other countries, among them the Soviet Union and the USA, and some international organisations (UN, League of Arab States).<sup>1</sup>

Opening the conference, Nehru said: "Perhaps one of the notable consequences of the European domination of Asia has been the isolation of the countries of Asia from one another... As that domination goes, the walls that surrounded us fall down and we look at each other again and meet as old friends long parted... But in order to have 'One World', we must also in Asia think of the countries of Asia co-operating together for that larger ideal."<sup>2</sup>

The conference attempted to formulate the principles for uniting the Asian states to struggle against colonialism and imperialism and to outline the way to ensure security through collective efforts. Thus, the Malayan delegate suggested that a neutral bloc of Asian states be set up to give organisational form to their cooperation to those ends. "The peace of Asia cannot be separated from world peace," said a delegate from Indonesia. "Asian co-operation would be aimed actually not at broadening the area of conflict but at narrowing it, and eliminating conflict altogether by doing

<sup>1</sup> See: *Asian Relations. Being Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference. New Delhi, March-April, 1947. Asian Relations Organisation*, New Delhi, India, 1948, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

away with the activities of the reactionary imperialist powers in Asian territories.”<sup>1</sup>

The idea was put forward at the conference of forming an Asian Relations Organisation to fulfill the role of a secretariat with broad executive functions. Branches of the secretariat were established in a number of Asian countries (Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, Nepal), but the opposition of Kuomintang's China, which had been against the Delhi conference and had held another in Nanking, held back the development of the Asian Relations Organisation instituted at the Delhi conference and of its national branches.

The organisation of Asian unity and solidarity was also obstructed by the colonial powers, which feared that the united efforts of the countries of the Asian continent would in time become a real force opposing Western interests in Asia.

When Anglo-Dutch troops landed on the island of Java in September 1945 following the proclamation of an independent Indonesian republic, the Burmese government proposed that a conference of Asian countries be convened to assist Indonesia. This was held in Delhi and was attended by 15 states, which vehemently demanded that the Dutch troops withdraw from the occupied lands and hand over power throughout Indonesia to the legitimate government of the young republic. The conference decisions had an impact on the UN Security Council, which was forced to demand that Holland cease military actions and recognise the independence of the Republic of Indonesia.

In January 1949, because of Holland's increased aggression against the Republic, an Asian Foreign Ministers Conference on Indonesia was convened in Delhi. It called on the Security Council to take the necessary steps to halt the Dutch aggression and implement effective measures to force it to carry out its recommendation should it refused to do so. The conference discussed the need for a permanent regional organisation of Asian countries to defend their security. “Is it not natural,” said Nehru in the opening speech, “that the free countries of Asia should begin to think of some more permanent arrangement than this Conference for effective mutual consultation and concerted effort in the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

pursuit of common aims...?”<sup>1</sup>

Nehru proposed the institution of a permanent All-Asian body which would meet to discuss the region's urgent problems. Other ideas were voiced at the conference. Ceylonese Prime Minister Solomon Bandaranaike raised the question of a regional “mutual defence” military organisation comprising all countries of South and Southeast Asia.

A conference resolution stated that the participating states should consult with each other on the ways and methods of creating a suitable mechanism for the region to develop consultations and cooperation within the United Nations. This resolution laid the foundation for one of the institutional forms of the young states' anti-imperialist and anti-colonial unity within the UN—the Afro-Asian group. However, the group confined its activity to the UN and furthermore did not include many Afro-Asian countries and peoples.

Along with the search for institutional forms for uniting the young states, there loomed large the question of elaborating the basic principles of struggle for peaceful cooperation on the continent, for the building of a renovated Asia free from imperialist domination and the yoke of foreign capital. These were to be principles and norms of relations on which the newly independent countries could rely in establishing peaceful, sound ties between the peoples of the continent.

The five principles of peaceful coexistence (also known as Panchsheel) in the preamble to the April 1954 India-China agreement on India's trade with Tibet came to be regarded as just such principles and norms of inter-state relations.

These principles were developed and concretised in the new situation at the historic April 1955 Bandung Conference, whose conduct and decisions were dictated by life itself, by the logic of the newly-independent countries' fight against traditional colonialism and neo-colonialism in the conditions obtaining at the time.

The Bandung conference aimed to show the Asian and African peoples how to struggle against the cold-war policy and the imperialist blocs, and for peace and peaceful coexis-

<sup>1</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy. Selected Speeches, September 1946-April 1961*, The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1961, pp. 410-411.



tence. It not only recognised the five principles of peaceful coexistence but also supplemented and developed them into a coherent system which represented the political and legal basis for relations between states with different social systems. The next chapter will deal with this in greater detail, but it is important to note here that the deepening and concretisation of the Panchsheel principles and their development into the ten principles of the Bandung Conference facilitated the codification of the legal basis of the peace-loving foreign policy of the newly-independent states and helped to unify them on an anti-imperialist, anti-colonial basis.

The Bandung Conference was a body that defended the rights of the Afro-Asian peoples, an important instrument of their struggle against the imperialist yoke, for free and independent development. It brought the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America into the international arena as an organised force in the fight against colonialism and imperialism.

Bandung conclusively confirmed the truth that the strength of the emancipated peoples lies in their unity, cohesion and solidarity. There is good reason why whenever the imperialist states carried out aggression, the democratic world public proposed the convening of the next session of the Bandung Conference.

The doctrine of non-alignment took shape in the complicated conditions of the cold war when first NATO was formed and then the socialist community established the Warsaw Treaty as a defence grouping to counter it. However, unlike the imperialist powers, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have never had military blocs in either Asia, Africa or Latin America. Therefore the question which faced the emergent countries was one of whether or not to join the imperialist blocs. For that reason, from the very outset non-participation in blocs actually meant non-alignment with the imperialist blocs like SEATO, CENTO, ASPAC, ANZUS, etc.

Hence it follows that the young states' refusal to join the imperialist-created blocs meant that they were distancing their foreign policy from global anti-Sovietism and anti-communism and from the imperialist states' bloc policy, were cooperating with the USSR and other socialist countries, and were developing political and economic ties with

them on a basis of equality and mutual advantage.

Chronologically, India was the first non-aligned country, and its leader Jawaharlal Nehru was the first to formulate the essence of the doctrine of non-alignment. Outlining independent India's foreign policy at the Constituent Assembly in December 1947, Prime Minister Nehru said: "The main subject in foreign policy today is vaguely talked of in terms of 'Do you belong to this group or that group?' That is an utter simplification of issues... We have sought to avoid foreign entanglements by not joining one bloc or the other ... we were trying to act according to our own light and according to the merits of the dispute as they seemed to us."<sup>1</sup>

Having analysed the world situation, Nehru came to the conclusion that the young national states could consolidate their freedom and independence if they took an independent position in the world, i.e. kept out of the imperialist blocs and did not follow the foreign policy of the former mother countries, which was openly anti-Soviet and anti-communist.

As Nehru understood it, non-alignment did not mean that the non-aligned countries should be equidistant from the opposing military and political camps; rather it meant non-alignment with blocs in the sense of non-alignment with bloc policy, i.e. with a policy contradicting the interests of young independent states. As Indira Gandhi later explained, "it is untenable to interpret non-alignment as equidistance from the superpowers. On the contrary, non-alignment is something very positive. It means taking every chance to improve the outlook of peace and to adopt a clear stand on matters on which we have strong convictions. Take racialism and colonialism. Did not the so-called democratic West take obstructive positions on decolonization and apartheid? Even now, looking at the support given to South Africa and Israel, its record does not shine. The Soviet Union's consistent stand on such matters has brought us closer together. The question is not of our voting with the Soviet Union so much as the Soviet Union voting with the countries of Asia and Africa, and supporting freedom movements and struggles against colonialism."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 24-25.

<sup>2</sup> *New Times, A Soviet Weekly of World Affairs*, No 9, February 1983, p. 79.

Nehru saw non-alignment as an effective means that could help the emergent countries to pursue an independent foreign policy and enable them freely to choose positions on very important international issues without binding themselves to policies pursued by great powers. However, the interests of the struggle for independence, peace and progress objectively brought the position of India and other young independent countries closer to world socialism, which was fighting for those same goals. On the other hand, the young national states' foreign policy objectives came into contradiction with the interests of the imperialist powers, which were trying to replace one form of domination with another, i.e. to ensnare the emergent countries in new forms of colonial dependence instead of colonialism of the old type.

Nehru's personality, views and world outlook have left a mark on India's whole foreign policy. India made a definite contribution to ending the war in Korea and to the peaceful settlement of other conflicts; it has actively supported the national liberation movements, opposed colonialism and racism and the creation of military blocs and bases on foreign territories, and demanded that they be liquidated.

Jawaharlal Nehru did not confine his activity within his national borders: he sought to unify all young independent countries' efforts in the anti-imperialist and neo-colonialist struggle. He wanted peace, disarmament and prevention of war on the basis of unity and cohesion of all progressive forces and movements.

It is to Nehru's credit that in elaborating the doctrine of non-alignment he took into consideration not only the interests of his own country but also those of all countries which gained their independence. He feared that without a correct foreign policy orientation the young national states would again become easy prey for the imperialist states' neo-colonialist designs. Nehru saw the concept of non-alignment as a means of bringing the emerged countries together and creating a united front of struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Nehru's views were nowhere near communist, but his thinking on international events was directly opposed to those of the apologists for imperialism. Describing him as an outstanding political and state leader, former Indian ambas-

sador to the USSR K. P. S. Menon said that Nehru was not an opponent of communism and that he approached communism as a phenomenon that needed to be considered in a historical perspective. Nehru, Menon writes, felt that communism is an idea and that ideas cannot be destroyed by force. He feared that any attempt to do so in the nuclear age could lead to the destruction of civilisation. The principal aim of Nehru's foreign policy was to maintain peace. He did not want to widen the gulf between the two opposing blocs by joining either of them, but rather sought to build bridges between them.

In this connection it should be noted that an approach which brackets neutrality and non-alignment together is not a scientifically sound one. Neutrality is a passive and inactive attitude to international events, while non-alignment is an active, offensive political factor that influences world politics. As Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi said, the principle of non-alignment is not a declaration of indifference stemming from neutrality, but an expression of independent thinking.

Explaining the essence of non-alignment, Nehru stressed that it has nothing to do with neutrality, passivity or isolation in international affairs. He said, that India should not pursue a policy of fence sitting.

In an effort to make the policy of neutrality more effective, some neutral countries started to describe their foreign policy course as "positive" or "active" neutrality. But even these attempts to invigorate the concept of neutralism could no longer satisfy the needs of the developing countries in the new conditions in which a priority was defence of national independence and vigorous actions in the world arena to restructure international relations on a new basis.

With the appearance of the world socialist system, which the young national states saw as a reliable friend and defender of their interests, the emergent countries that had taken positions of neutralism began more actively to oppose imperialism and its policy of plunder and aggression. Their foreign policy was transformed into one of active opposition to the system of imperialist blocs, into one of active struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and for international peace and security.

However, it would be a mistake to believe that external

factors alone are responsible for the emergence of non-alignment; internal social, political and economic factors also played a part. These were above all the resolve of the colonial and dependent countries to do away with the vestiges of foreign domination and gain complete freedom and independence; break out of the age-old backwardness and poverty, eradicate illiteracy and oppression, raise the working people's living standard, liquidate the feudal and semi-feudal remnants and religious prejudices, and rebuild society on new democratic principles.

A number of factors prevented the young sovereign states from gaining political freedom and economic independence simultaneously. The bulk of them remained in the capitalist economic system, which circumstance heightened still further the contradiction between the young countries and the large capitalist powers. The colonialists had left deep traces in the economy of the countries which gained their freedom: according to the UN, the average annual per capita national income in Asia and Africa was less than \$130 in 1960.<sup>1</sup>

Economic revival of the young countries called for a new approach not only to domestic but also to foreign policy, and the close interaction of foreign and domestic economic policy. The emergent countries' socio-economic problems required a fresh approach to international problems as well, a fresh foreign policy orientation.

The process of their liberation from the foreign political yoke had given the young countries great experience of struggle for their freedom and independence, and they relied on the rich democratic traditions connected with the struggle for peace and social justice. These countries had political parties and social organisations which guided the broad masses to demand radical change and a new social order. In the majority of the countries which gained their freedom the most active social groups were the national bourgeoisie, the progressive intelligentsia and patriotic part of the military. In many countries the liberation struggle had been led by the national bourgeois circles, which were interested in eliminating foreign capital's stranglehold and the colonial structure of the economy, and wanted to replace the Western monopolies' omnipotence with their own domi-

<sup>1</sup> *World Economic Survey, 1963*, United Nations, New York, 1964, p. 21.

nation. To this end, the national bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois elements needed not only socio-economic transformations inside the country but also a new foreign policy course.

Dependent as they were on foreign capital, the national patriotic circles of a number of emergent countries did not want to be drawn into the struggle between world socialism and world capitalism and sought a middle way for their foreign policy, but since the former mother countries were trying to keep the young national states within their sphere of domination, the latter sought cooperation and assistance from socialist countries, forcing the Western powers to make concessions and look for new, less naked forms of exploitation of the countries which gained their freedom.

The USSR gives enormous assistance to the Arab peoples in their fight against American-Israeli aggression. The peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, South Yemen and other countries know very well that the attainment of their freedom and independence was closely linked with the USSR's disinterested assistance.

The existence of the powerful fraternity of socialist states not only protects the freedom and independence of the emergent states but also helps them to be more resolute in their dealings with the former mother countries by creating the necessary prerequisites for obtaining economic aid from the West on more favourable terms and without joining their military and political alliances. Eminent Indian scholar J. Bandyopadhyaya has said in this regard that the "poli-co-economic objectives of foreign aid could be achieved only through a policy of non-alignment since such a policy alone could ensure the diversification of the sources of aid as well as prevent the exercise of political pressure".<sup>1</sup>

Although the non-bloc doctrine and policy of non-alignment served the interests of the ruling classes above all, it met with a positive response among broad strata of the population of the emergent countries and was actively supported by progressive world public opinion because it was directed against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, championed the national interests and maintained peace.

<sup>1</sup> *Indian Foreign Policy. The Nehru Years*, Edited by B. R. Nanda, Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd, Delhi, Bombay, Bangalore, Kanpur, 1976, p. 173.

The non-aligned movement's active role and impact on world politics were not immediately manifest, but the universal character of Nehru's non-aligned principles was evident in the fact that they were being supported by an increasing number of emergent countries in Asia and Africa and then in Latin America as well.

Views similar to Nehru's were held by other outstanding Asian, African and Latin American leaders who, along with him, exerted tremendous efforts to unite the young national states on a non-aligned basis and organise and develop the non-aligned movement. They were Ho Chi Minh, Pham Van Dong, Josip Tito, Gamal Nasser, Ahmed Sukarno, Kwame Nkrumah, Solomon Bandaranaike, Osvaldo Dorticos, Makarios, U Nu, Modibo Keita and other prominent leaders of the national liberation movement. An active role in the non-aligned movement was later played by Indira Gandhi, Fidel Castro, Le Duan, Kim Il Sung, Mengistu Haile Mariam, Houari Boumediène, Sékou Touré, Rajiv Gandhi and many other distinguished leaders of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Certain historical conditions caused Josip Tito to pay a great deal of attention to the non-aligned movement. Like Nehru and other leaders of emergent nations, he believed that the non-aligned movement should not be a small group of states, that it could become an influential force of today only if it involves, as far as possible, all states that share its goals and principles. "In order to make it possible successfully to champion basic legitimate rights and influence international processes", Tito recalled, "it was necessary to pool our efforts. Despite all the differences, Nehru, Nasser and I, and later Sukarno, Nkrumah and others, thought alike and were striving for the same thing; we took immediate steps to form the non-aligned movement."<sup>1</sup>

In an effort to expand the movement geographically, Tito made trips to various countries of Asia and Africa to discuss convening an enlarged conference of heads of state or government.

In June 1961, on the initiative of Nehru, Nasser, Tito, Sukarno and Nkrumah, a meeting of representatives from 20 countries of Asia, Africa and Europe, and an observer from

<sup>1</sup> *Mezhdunarodnaya Politika*, Belgrade, No. 704-705, August 20, 1979, p. 15.

Brazil was held in Cairo to make preparations for a conference of heads of state or government of all non-aligned countries. Convened in early September 1961 in Belgrade on the recommendation of the Cairo meeting, that conference laid the foundations for the further development of the non-aligned movement and opened up a new important page in the history of international relations. The Sixth non-aligned conference (Havana 1979) agreed that the 'historic (20th) anniversary of the inception of the movement should be appropriately celebrated'; and the Foreign Ministers' meeting convened to prepare for the Delhi non-aligned summit (1981) declared the opening of the Belgrade conference (1 September) "Non-Alignment Day" and recommended that it should be marked each year.

The historical significance of the First Conference lies also in the fact that the preparatory Cairo meeting formulated the criteria for non-aligned membership:

- the country should have adopted an independent policy based on the coexistence of states with different political and social systems and on non-alignment, or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy;

- should be consistently supporting the Movements for National Independence;

- should not be a member of a multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts;

- if a country has a bilateral military agreement with a Great Power or is a member of a regional defence pact, the agreement or pact should not be one concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts;

- if it has conceded military bases to a Foreign Power, the concession should not have been made in the context of Great Power conflicts.

These criteria have remained virtually unchanged to the present day. They were confirmed at the 1979 Havana conference and also guided the 1983 Delhi conference.

The strict criteria elaborated in Cairo and approved in Belgrade meant that many countries that had attended the Bandung conference were not at the first summit conference, a circumstance which gave the movement a pronounced anti-imperialist character from the very outset.

Later, under Western pressure, countries with conservative regimes repeatedly tried to "liberalise", or rather to wa-



ter down these criteria so as to open the door to any country that expressed a desire to join the non-aligned movement. This would have given access even to countries which are directly linked with imperialist blocs or have Western military bases on their territory.

On the whole the non-alignment criteria are rather flexible. They ensure the movement's internal cohesion and particular political homogeneity, thus creating a fairly firm foundation to work for the goals and principles of the movement.

Yet it must be admitted that even with those criteria a number of states which joined the non-aligned movement do not share its goals and principles and have been working from the inside to weaken and even destroy it. This has somewhat polarised the participants in the movement, which has both a progressive anti-imperialist core and a group of countries that avoids active struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism and attempts to impose conciliatory slogans and goals contrary to the very essence of non-alignment.

Many non-aligned states question the membership of countries that now have US military bases on their territory or pursue a pro-imperialist policy. On the other hand, attempts are being made to isolate socialist and socialist-oriented countries in the movement under the pretext that they are connected with the socialist community and therefore belong to the Warsaw Treaty.

The struggle inside the movement around the criteria of non-alignment sometimes boils over into a sharp political polemic about the very essence, goals and principles of the movement. The progressive core has been repeatedly called on to counter the attacks of the subversive elements and consolidate the movement on its original positions of struggle for peace and social progress.

The goals and tasks of the non-aligned movement were originally formulated at the 1961 Belgrade Conference, whose "Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries on the Danger of War and Appeal for Peace" said that war is an anachronism and a crime against humanity and that the international community can organise its affairs without resort to war. The Declaration stated that "a lasting peace can be achieved only if ... colo-

nialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations (are) radically eliminated".<sup>1</sup>

Other very important tasks outlined were the need to oppose colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid; to support the national liberation movements; to eliminate foreign military bases; to work for universal and complete disarmament and a ban on nuclear weapon tests; and to press for an end to economic inequality and for the development of an effective economic and trade cooperation between developing countries.

As the movement evolved, these goals and principles were defined more exactly and supplemented with new propositions in line with the changing international situation.

A very important outcome of the Belgrade Conference was that it officially proclaimed the non-aligned countries' rejection of a bloc policy. "The non-aligned countries represented at this Conference do not wish to form a new bloc and cannot be a bloc. They sincerely desire to co-operate with any Government which seeks to contribute to the strengthening of confidence and peace in the world."<sup>2</sup>

Addressing the First Conference, Nehru interpreted the concept of non-alignment as follows: "... the word non-aligned may be differently interpreted but basically it was used and coined almost with the meaning non-aligned with the great Power blocs of the world. Non-aligned has a negative meaning but if you give it a positive connotation it means nations which object to this lining-up for war purposes—military blocs, military alliances and the like. Therefore we keep away from this and we want to throw our weight, such as it is, in favour of peace."<sup>3</sup>

The historical significance of the Belgrade Conference therefore lies in the fact that it formulated the criteria, essence, basic goals and principles of non-alignment.

Following the Belgrade Conference, major changes occurred which had a marked effect on the non-aligned movement as well. In just three years 30 independent states, mostly African, emerged and joined the movement, bringing

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents of the Gathering of the Non-Aligned Countries, 1961-1962*, Published by Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, 1983, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. Belgrade, September 1-6, 1961*, Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 1961, p. 256.

to it a militant spirit of implacability toward all forms of imperialist exploitation and economic slavery. The voice of the non-aligned countries was increasingly heard at the UN and the most important international forums.

The second non-aligned summit conference, held in Cairo in October 1964, was attended by 46 states—almost a half of all independent countries at the time. The conference's "Programme for Peace and International Cooperation" stressed that the only possible means of strengthening peace was peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. It stated that the right to full independence and self-determination should be accorded to all nations, that states' sovereign rights should be recognised and strictly observed, and that states should refrain from the use or threat of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other states. The conference demanded that all states refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of other states, that international conflicts should be settled peacefully, and that all states should work vigorously to ease international tension and effect universal and complete disarmament.

The summit also agreed that it is incumbent on all countries to facilitate the speedy establishment of a new, more just world system of economic relations.

The 1970 Lusaka summit conference was the first one to be attended by representatives of national liberation movements. It declared its full support for the peoples of Indo-China in their struggle against the USA's plunderous aggression.

This third conference gave a broader definition of non-alignment. "The policy of non-alignment," the Lusaka Declaration said, "emerged as the result of the determination of independent countries to safeguard their national independence and the legitimate rights of their peoples. The growth of non-alignment into a broad international movement cutting across racial, religious and other barriers, is an integral part of significant changes in the structure of the entire international community. This is the product of the world anticolonial revolution and of the emergence of a large number of newly-liberated countries which, opting for an independent political orientation and development, have refused to accept the replacement of centuries-old forms of subordination by new ones. At the root of these changes lies

the ever more clearly expressed aspiration of nations for freedom, independence and equality, and their determination to resist all forms of oppression and exploitation. This has been the substance and meaning of our strivings and actions... At a time when the polarization of the international community on a bloc basis was believed to be a permanent feature of international relations and the threat of a nuclear conflict between the Big Powers an ever-present spectre hovering over mankind, the non-aligned countries opened up new prospects for the contemporary world and paved the way for relaxation of international tension.”<sup>1</sup>

The fourth non-aligned summit conference, held in 1973 in Algeria, played a major role in consolidating the ranks of the movement and emphasised the importance of the non-aligned countries cooperating with the socialist countries and other peace-loving and democratic forces.

Addressing the Algerian conference, Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba, laid stress on the need to oppose imperialism and colonialism. “For us,” he said, “the world is divided into capitalist countries and socialist countries, into imperialist countries and colonial countries, into reactionary countries and progressive countries; and into governments that support imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and racism and governments which oppose them.

We feel that that is the main thing with respect to alignment and non-alignment. Our principal duty is therefore to wage a vigorous struggle against the crimes which have been committed against humanity.”

The Algerian conference decided to establish a Coordinating Bureau to prepare for the next conference and to coordinate actions and elaborate agreed non-aligned positions at the most important international forums, the UN first and foremost.

The fifth non-aligned conference, which took place in 1976 in Colombo, was attended by 85 member countries, with 13 states present as observers and seven as guests.

The conference was held at a time when detente was the dominant tendency in international relations. Major changes

<sup>1</sup> *Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Lusaka, Sept. 8-10, 1970.*

had occurred in the world: the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe had taken place in Helsinki, and the national liberation movements in Africa and Asia had scored a number of important victories. American imperialism had suffered a severe defeat in Indo-China, a national democratic revolution had triumphed in Ethiopia, and the fascist regimes in Spain and Greece had been toppled.

The conference declared that non-alignment symbolises humanity's search for peace and security among nations and the determination to establish a new and equitable international economic, social and political order. Attention was focussed on drawing up a programme on security and disarmament, and it was pointed out that there is a direct link between the struggle for peace and detente and the struggle against imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid.

An important result of the Colombo conference was the decision to set up a News Agencies Pool to keep within bounds the West's dissemination of information in the newly-independent countries and to strengthen the national mass media.

The sixth summit took place in 1979 in Havana in a complicated international situation and holds a special place in the history of the non-aligned movement. Imperialist reaction sought to prevent the conference from being held in revolutionary Cuba and tried to sow division and discord in the movement before it convened. However, the intrigues of the imperialist circles and their political agents were a complete failure. The movement not only managed to preserve its unity but also consolidated it on an anti-imperialist platform. The conference stated in no uncertain terms that peaceful coexistence is the only alternative to the danger of a military confrontation, and that detente in Europe enhances the security of all states, especially those that do not belong to military alliances. The Havana conference closely and thoroughly examined the situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, expressed full solidarity with the struggle of the region's peoples, and advocated exclusively peaceful settlement of conflicts.

The results of the Havana conference reconfirmed the strength and viability of the non-aligned movement and its ability, despite imperialist interference, to resolve the most

complicated questions of our time in the interests of peace and international security on the basis of consensus among all its participants.

After the Havana conference, the Socialist Republic of Cuba was called upon to fulfill the duties of Chairman of the movement from 1979 to 1984 in an extremely complicated world situation: 1) it headed the movement in the most difficult period of its 20-year history; 2) it was the first time that the movement was being led by a socialist country; 3) it was Chairman of the movement at a time when imperialism was stepping up subversion against Cuba itself.

In spite of all that, Cuba was equal to the role and did a great deal of constructive work. The seventh conference in 1983 took for granted Fidel Castro's summary of Cuba's chairmanship: "...we can state as testimony of having fulfilled a duty that the unity of our movement has not been weakened, that its vigour has grown, that its independence has been safeguarded against all schemes to curtail it." Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi therefore had every reason to say: "I should like to express our Movement's gratitude to President Fidel Castro for the burden of chairmanship he has borne with characteristic determination, capability and dignity over the last three and a half years."<sup>1</sup>

The most representative non-aligned summits were the 1983 Delhi conference and the 1986 Harare conference, which were attended by 99 countries and were particularly convincing proof that the general direction of the non-aligned movement is toward peace and security, an end to the arms race and disarmament, economic decolonisation, and final eradication of colonialism and racism.

The late Chairman of the movement, Indira Gandhi, made a pithy summation of its history at the Delhi conference: "Non-alignment is national independence and freedom".<sup>2</sup>

Even a brief analysis of the documents of the seven summit conferences held between 1961 and 1983 will show that the basic principles and goals of non-alignment have not undergone any substantial change.

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*. April 8, 1983, p. 144. Appendix II. Keynote.  
<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

Today, too, the movement's principal objectives are largely those proclaimed at the First Conference in Belgrade:

- to struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all forms of racial discrimination;

- to struggle to establish the principles of peaceful co-existence in relations between countries with different social systems, to strengthen peace and international security, to end the nuclear arms race, and effect universal and complete disarmament;

- to struggle to restructure international relations on an equitable, democratic basis and create a new international economic order;

- to struggle against information imperialism and for a new information order;

- to struggle against imperialist and other interference in the non-aligned movement, and for consolidation of its ranks on an anti-imperialist basis.

What is it that unites the movement today?

Today, too, the economic backwardness of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and their dependent position in the system of international economic relations are the objective basis that brings these countries together, and the desire to overcome the centuries-old backwardness is the cementing force of non-alignment. The majority of the movement's participants realise that the way to surmount underdevelopment and enhance national independence is to unify their ranks and pool their efforts in the fight against imperialism and neo-colonialism, which are primarily to blame for their social and economic backwardness.

An equally important unifying factor is the desire for peace, the desire to establish the principles of peaceful co-existence as a norm in relations between countries with different social systems, as the only basis of international relations. The non-aligned movement regards the preservation and strengthening of peace, deepening of detente, defusing of international tension, and the struggle against the arms race as an indispensable condition for social and economic development, a prerequisite for successful struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

The new edition of the CPSU Programme adopted at the 27th Party Congress says that the USSR shall continue to be on the side of the non-aligned states, which are a force

working for peace, combating aggression, hegemonism and seeking negotiated settlements of disputes and conflicts.

The established structure of the movement functions efficiently. The principal body—the Conference of Heads of State or Government—meets every three years as a rule, while the second body—the Foreign Ministers Meeting—assembles once every 18 months. The Coordinating Bureau meets as required and functions as the movement's executive body. It is assisted by the plenary sessions, meetings of delegation heads of non-aligned countries at each General Assembly session, and by the most effective body—the Plenary Meeting of those countries' UN mission heads. In addition, there are "secondary" bodies like the News Agencies Pool of Non-Aligned Countries and other associations, and also various seminars, commissions, etc., of social organisations and experts from those countries.

The non-aligned movement has been ever more resolutely advocating democratisation of international relations and equitable participation in the taking of important decisions that affect the vital interests of the developing countries. They demand a new international legal order, and a greater role for the UN and other international organisations in resolving the developing world's acute political, economic and other problems.

The popularity and appeal of non-alignment's goals and principles enhances its prestige in the eyes of the entire liberated world and the progressive world public, and draws more and more countries, and national liberation and other socio-political movements into its ranks.

It is therefore not surprising that the movement's membership quadrupled from 25 at the first conference in 1961 to 102 at the seventh in 1983. When the sixth conference opened in Havana in 1979, the population of the non-aligned states was over 1,696 million: 418,295,000 in Africa, 1,189,391,000 in Asia, 67,516,000 in Latin America, and 22,918,000 in Europe. Almost all countries of Africa, 29 Asian countries and a quarter of the countries of America were represented at the seventh conference in Delhi.

The table below shows the dynamics of the increase in the number of members, observers (states and national liberation movements) and guests (states, international organisations, UN bodies, national liberation movements) attending



the conferences of heads of state or government of the non-aligned countries.

Conference	Status of Representa- tion:	Participants			Observers		Guests	
		s t a t e s	natio- nal libera- tion move- ments	s t a t e s	natio- nal libera- tion move- ments	s t a t e s	natio- nal libera- tion move- ments	s t a t e s
First Conference, Belgrade, 1-6/9/61		25	—	3	—	—	—	—
Second Conference, Cairo, 5-10/10/64		46 <sup>1</sup>	—	10	—	—	—	—
Third Conference, Lusaka, 8-10/9/70		54	—	9	—	—	8	—
Fourth Conference, Algiers, 5-9/9/73		75	—	8	12	3	—	—
Fifth Conference, Colombo, 16-19/8/76		85	1	8	8	7	—	—
Sixth Conference, Havana, 3-9/9/79		92	3	12	5	8	1	—
Seventh Conference, Delhi, 7-11/3/83		99 <sup>2</sup>	2	10	1	10	—	—
Eighth Conference, Harare, 1-6/9/86		99	2	6	4	13	—	—

<sup>1</sup> The table was compiled on the basis of final conference documents. The UN and its bodies, and regional and other organisations are not included among the guests and observers.

<sup>2</sup> As indicated earlier, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, St. Lucia and Chile were not represented.

It would not be true to say that the development of the non-aligned movement has been a smooth process. As the movement grows, so does the number of problems which cannot be easily resolved; sharp internal contradictions often arise between countries with different social

systems and regimes, polarisation is taking place, and diverse centrifugal tendencies have been appearing. There has even been one voluntary withdrawal from the movement (Burma in 1979).

The situation in the movement is complicated by some leaders' renunciation of anti-imperialist positions, and eclectic and conciliatory concepts have been exerting a certain negative impact on the content and direction of the movement's activity.

Indira Gandhi referred on more than one occasion to the negative tendencies in the movement. "Personally," she said, "I think the movement expanded too much and included people who are not as nonaligned as they should be."<sup>1</sup>

But the difficulties facing the movement are only to be expected for it is very broad and open to all liberated countries and national liberation movements, which bring their specific sentiments into it and demand that their own complicated problems be given priority. All countries, both those recently liberated and those which won independence before the Second World War, may join the movement, irrespective of their social system, level of development of the productive forces, or size and geographical location. The sole criterion is non-participation in any multilateral or bilateral military alliance that includes a superpower, and no foreign military bases on the country's territory.

The non-aligned movement includes socialist countries, states with monarchic regimes, socialist-oriented countries, and countries that have embarked on a road of capitalist development. It has members that want the movement to work in close unity with the world socialist community for peace, detente and disarmament and against imperialism and neo-colonialism, but there are also those which would incline it toward cooperation with the imperialist states and advocated a policy of "equidistance" from the "two super-powers".

Another reason for the intensification of the opposing tendencies in the movement is that new people have replaced the first generation of leaders and founders. And while that first generation had launched and headed the national liberation struggle in their countries, the present leaders

<sup>1</sup> *The Washington Post*, December 7, 1980, p. A 25.

emerged in the post-war period and have naturally been introducing their ideas and concepts into the movement, ideas and concepts which, as experience shows, do not always accord with the spirit and realities of our day. Some of the leaders at times make purely pragmatic demands and express willingness to compromise with imperialism so as to make short-term gains.

These conditions naturally require ever greater efforts to preserve and develop positively the basic goals and principles of the movement.

Imperialism's aggravation of the world situation over the past few years makes it particularly necessary for the movement to be consistent in realising its goals and principles and in unifying its ranks on an anti-imperialist basis.

The strength and international prestige of the movement has always been, and still is, dependent on how consistently it adheres to what it has itself repeatedly stated in final conference documents, including the Political Declaration of the 1983 Delhi conference, which said that the quintessence of the policy of non-alignment 'has always consisted of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism, including zionism and against all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony as well as against great power and bloc policies tending to perpetuate the division of the world into blocs'. The Delhi conference also reiterated its unswerving adherence to the principles and goals of the non-aligned movement, stating that violation of these principles by any country is unjustifiable under any circumstances and is totally unacceptable.

Let us look at these foundations of the movement more in detail.

Peaceful Co-Existence—the Political and  
Legal Basis of the Non-Aligned Movement

In the previous chapter we saw that the emergence of the non-aligned movement as an important factor of world politics was a law-governed phenomenon of our time. "It is a reflection," Mikhail Gorbachev has said, "of the liberated peoples' striving for equitable cooperation of states, for recognition of their legitimate rights and interests, for the exclusion from international affairs of any manifestation of domination and diktat, of claims to world domination."

As a union of states, the non-aligned movement came into being on the basis of each member's commitment to a policy of peaceful co-existence. The very first meeting of non-aligned countries—the Preparatory Meeting held in Cairo in June 1961, which made preparations for the movement's first conference two and a half months later in Belgrade—adopted five criteria for membership, which were later approved in Belgrade, and have stood the test of time. The first criterion says that in order to join the movement a country "should have adopted an independent policy based on the co-existence of States with different political and social systems and on non-alignment or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy"<sup>1</sup>.

The Declaration of the first conference stated that the movement was being formed with a view to contributing more effectively to world peace and security and peaceful cooperation among peoples. It said that given the conditions at the beginning of the 1960s, "the principles of peaceful co-existence are the only alternative to the 'cold war' and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe. Thus, these principles ... are the only basis of all international relations."<sup>2</sup> This po-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

sition was later repeatedly confirmed in documents of the movement's main bodies. Indira Gandhi also said on more than one occasion that a policy of peaceful co-existence is the basis of non-alignment. Addressing the seventh conference in 1983, she stated: "It (non-alignment—*Ed.*) stands for peace and the avoidance of confrontation."<sup>1</sup> Robert Mugabe also spoke about this at the eighth conference.

The foregoing shows that the non-aligned countries consider themselves a peace-loving force whose outlook, to use Indira Gandhi's words, is still conditioned by anti-imperialism.<sup>2</sup> It should be added that, as UN members, they are also bound to a policy of peaceful co-existence under the United Nations Charter.

Furthermore, the movement regards non-alignment as a force championing peaceful co-existence in world politics. Thus, for example, the Political Declaration of the fourth conference said that "the policy of non-alignment ... was an important and irreplaceable factor in the struggle ... for the general enforcement of the principles of peaceful, active co-existence."<sup>3</sup>

What are the legal principles underlying the policy of peaceful co-existence and considered incumbent on the non-aligned countries? The most authoritative statement in this regard was made by Indira Gandhi at the seventh conference, where she listed the following "five principles which are the foundations of non-alignment": sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression, non-interference, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence. In other words, the Panchsheel principles that were formulated in the forementioned (Chapter 1) India-China agreement on India's trade with Tibet, which was signed on 29 April 1954 in Peking.

It is immediately evident that if the principles of peaceful co-existence, as the basis of non-alignment, are limited to these five, fundamentally important directions of the movement's political activity are thereby left out of the international legal foundation. These are above all the struggle against colonialism, whose legal basis is first and foremost the principle of peoples' self-determination;

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, 8 April 1983, Appendix II, pp. 144, 147.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

<sup>3</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 93.

prevention of confrontation and conflicts in inter-state relations, which is based on the principle of peaceful settlement of international disputes; the principle of banning the use or threat of force, and so on.

An explanation can probably be found in the fact that the Panchsheel principles, which include the principle of peaceful co-existence, were perceived by Afro-Asian countries, and later by the non-aligned movement as well, as the sum total of the principles of peaceful co-existence, and then as their core, their most essential part.

This is confirmed not only by how the concept "principles of peaceful co-existence" came into being but also by the development of those principles. The principle of peaceful co-existence is the most general principle of modern international law. It concisely expresses its essence, the essence of the law of peaceful co-existence of states with different, and above all opposite, socio-economic systems, the law of the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism.

As international law was democratised following and as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution—the disappearance of some of the old principles that had been engendered by the exploitative societies, the regeneration of some of those principles and the emergence of new ones under the direct impact of socialism and the upsurge in the national liberation movement—the principle of peaceful co-existence gave rise to other fundamental democratic principles and at the same time absorbed the essential features of many of them. For that reason, in the post-war period a whole system of principles of peaceful co-existence has been established and constitutes the core of the sum total of the norms and principles of international relations that is called modern international law. All these principles were for the first time universally recognised and enshrined in 1945 in Articles 1 and 2 of the UN Charter.

During the cold war of the 1950s, the Panchsheel principles could well have been regarded as forming such a core.

The Soviet Union welcomed the proclamation of the Panchsheel principles as the universally recognised basis of inter-state relations. Two years later and less than a year after the Bandung conference, the 20th CPSU Congress stressed that the historical significance of these principles,

which had been supported by the Bandung conference and the international public at large, lies in the fact that they define the best form of relations between states with different social systems under present conditions, and suggested that these principles should become the basis of peaceful relations between all states in all parts of the globe, thereby meeting the vital interests and demands of the peoples.

The Soviet Union understood that inclusion of these principles in the 1954 Indo-Chinese agreement represented official recognition, outside the sphere of Soviet foreign policy relations, that Lenin's theory of peaceful co-existence is substantiated by history and the course which the Soviet state has been following since its emergence in 1917 is an objective necessity.

Note should be made of an important historical fact: the Soviet Union was able to welcome the objective birth of the non-aligned movement five and a half years before it was officially founded because at that time the first non-aligned countries, India above all, had resolutely opposed war and the arms race and advocated lasting peace and security of the peoples, and the strengthening of peaceful co-existence.

Having appeared on the international scene, the young states, including the non-aligned ones, began to extend the package of principles of peaceful co-existence. In April 1955 the Bandung conference attended by twenty-four Asian and five African countries adopted a Declaration on Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation which listed ten principles of peaceful co-existence of states in a spirit of tolerance, goodneighbourliness and friendly cooperation.

In addition to what was said in Chapter 1, it should be stated, first of all, that respect for the purposes and principles of the UN Charter was established as the first principle. The progressive doctrine of international law regards the principles of the UN Charter as the principles of peaceful co-existence. In the order in which they appear in the Charter, these principles are: equality and self-determination of the peoples, cooperation between states to realise the UN objectives, sovereign equality of states, conscientious fulfilment of the commitments assumed under the UN Charter, peaceful settlement of international disputes, non-use or threat of force in international relations (both against the

territorial integrity or political independence of any state, and in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN), all-round assistance to the UN in keeping with its Charter, non-interference in the internal affairs of any state.

These basic provisions of the UN Charter are for all intents and purposes outlined in seven of the other nine principles of the Bandung conference. These principles which it outlined were the principles of peaceful co-existence, principles which would make it incumbent on all countries, as the Declaration itself said, "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to develop friendly cooperation"<sup>1</sup> It is important to underscore that the Bandung Declaration was formulated by both socialist and capitalist countries,<sup>2</sup> by countries that had declared themselves non-aligned and by those linked with the imperialist powers by military agreements of alliance.<sup>3</sup>

It is important to make note of two points when speaking about this document in the context of looking at peaceful co-existence as the political and legal basis of the non-aligned movement. First of all, the conference had been directly initiated by non-aligned (with the exception of Pakistan) countries—by President Sukarno of Indonesia and then by Nehru of India and the leaders of Burma, Pakistan and Ceylon. Second, despite opposition from Pakistan, Thailand, Turkey, the Philippines, South Vietnam, and Japan, which were linked with the USA, Britain and France, the non-aligned countries managed to have the Bandung Declaration not only confirm the principles of peaceful co-existence as the objectively indispensable basis of inter-state relations in the modern world, but also begin the elaboration, for the first time on such a broad basis, of what later became known as "the non-alignment principle" (see below).

As was stated in Chapter 1, at the time of the Bandung

<sup>1</sup> *Charter of the United Nations*, New York, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Socialist participants were the People's Republic of China and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The capitalist participants were Japan, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Turkey, and others that had taken a capitalist road of development.

<sup>3</sup> The non-aligned countries at that time were: Afghanistan, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Ethiopia, and others. Those linked with the imperialist powers were: Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, South Vietnam and Japan.



conference, the United States and its allies were vigorously seeking to knock together military blocs in the Pacific, Asia and Africa. In 1951, Australia, New Zealand and the USA formed the ANZUS military and political bloc. In 1954 SEATO came into being with Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand as members in addition to the USA, Britain and France. While preparations were under way for the Bandung conference, a new bloc—CENTO—emerged, initially comprising Turkey and Iraq, which were joined on the very eve of the conference (4 April 1955) by Britain, and later by Iran and Pakistan.<sup>1</sup> A general argument referred to in the text of the treaties creating these blocs was “the right to individual or collective defence”. Those bloc members that were attending the Bandung conference insisted that respect for this right should be among the ten principles of the Bandung Declaration (Principle No. 5), invoking the UN Charter<sup>2</sup> in so doing. Those countries which opposed to participation in such blocs managed to get a safeguard principle included: the principle of respect for the right to individual or collective defence was followed by a principle intended to protect young states from use of the preceding principle to encroach on the independence and sovereignty of Afro-Asian countries. It was divided into two sub-points. The first was in essence a demand being made of the imperialist superpowers, including bloc members: “abstention from the use of arrangement of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big powers.” The second was directed primarily at other countries participating in military blocs: “abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries.”<sup>3</sup>

It should be underscored that the stance of the future non-aligned countries in pressing for international recognition of their “non-bloc” interests was very closely linked with their desire to have international relations based on the principles of peaceful co-existence of states with different social and political systems.

<sup>1</sup> Pakistan—23 September and Iran—3 November 1955.

<sup>2</sup> This right is contained in Article 51 of the UN Charter.

<sup>3</sup> *Non-Aligned Conferences. Basic Documents, 1961-1975*, Compiled and Published by Bandaranaike Centre for International Studies, Colombo, 1976, p. V.

The movement's first conference showed that this is indeed so.

One last point needs to be made about the Bandung Declaration. Documents of the non-aligned movement, and more often speakers at non-aligned meetings and writers claim that this declaration is an instrument of the movement or that its principles were formulated by the movement. This is not so because, as has already been said, the Bandung Declaration was elaborated not only by proponents of a nonbloc orientation but also by countries that were bloc members. At the same time, it would be correct to say that it is the first multilateral Afro-Asian sanction and development of the principles of peaceful co-existence carried out at summit level. In this sense the document, like the UN Charter, is a source of the political and legal basis of non-alignment.

The foregoing explains why it was not difficult for the 25 non-aligned countries, which gathered in Belgrade in September 1961 and formalised their movement, to discuss fundamental principles. They were able to come together precisely because a common basis had been found long before the meeting, a basis that was reflected both in the first criterion for participation in their movement and in the Belgrade Declaration. They opposed the division of the world into military and political blocs, for which imperialism is to blame, and called for non-participation in them because they wanted peaceful co-existence and peace.

In this they enjoyed the full support of the Soviet Union, as they had always done. The Message from the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to the Conference Chairman stated that "because they have set themselves major tasks of peaceful construction, the government and peoples of the Soviet Union continue, as they have always done, to regard the ideas of peaceful cooperation and co-existence of states as the basis of their foreign policy. They therefore warmly welcome any step aimed to curb the forces of war".

The 1964 non-aligned proposal that the UN codify the principles of peaceful co-existence in 1965, when the UN would celebrate its 20th anniversary, confirmed that the movement's political and legal basis is peaceful co-existence. These proposals were outlined in a special (the fourth) section of the Programme for Peace and International Coopera-

tion, the basic document adopted at the second conference. Recognising that peaceful co-existence is "the only way to strengthen world peace", the Conference solemnly proclaimed the following fundamental principles of peaceful co-existence:

1) the right of all peoples to complete independence; 2) the right of all peoples to self-determination; 3) peaceful co-existence between States with differing social and political systems; 4) the sovereign equality of States must be recognised and respected. It includes the right of all peoples to the free exploitation of their natural resources; 5) States must abstain from all use or threat of force; a situation brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognised; every State must abstain from interfering in the affairs of other States; 6) all States shall respect the fundamental rights and freedoms of the human person and the equality of all nations and races; 7) all international conflicts must be settled by peaceful means on the basis of equality and sovereignty, ... all States must apply themselves to promoting and strengthening measures designed to diminish international tension and achieve general and complete disarmament; 8) all States must cooperate with a view to accelerating economic development in the world, and particularly in the developing countries; 9) States shall meet their international obligations in good faith in conformity with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.<sup>1</sup>

While doing justice to this non-aligned initiative, it would not be correct to state that up to that time the question of codification of those principles had not been raised. Almost two years before the second conference, a number of countries, including the USSR, had sponsored a resolution entitled "Consideration of principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations" which was adopted as UN General Assembly Resolution 1815/XVII.

Among other things, this resolution recognised "the urgency and importance of maintaining and strengthening international peace founded upon freedom, equality and social justice, and therefore of developing peaceful and neigh-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 21.

hourly relations among States, irrespective of their differences or the relative stages or nature of their political, economic and social development.”<sup>1</sup> Note was made in this connection of the paramount importance of the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States embodied in the UN Charter, “which is the fundamental statement of those principles.”<sup>2</sup> For the sake of comparison with those outlined in the Programme of the Second Non-Aligned Conference, below are given the seven principles listed in the resolution:

1) The principle that States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

2) The principle that States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered;

3) The duty not to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, in accordance with the Charter;

4) The duty of States to cooperate with one another in accordance with the Charter;

5) The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples;

6) The principle of sovereign equality of States;

7) The principle that States shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.<sup>3</sup>

It is evident that these principles were reflected in the second conference proposal, whose additional Principles 1, 3 and 6 are fully covered by the seven principles of Resolution 1815/XVII. Yet they were included because of the special significance of those questions for the non-aligned movement. In this connection it should be noted that the movement's principles have been listed in the final documents of almost all its conferences, and though their number has differed substantially each time, their essence has largely remained unchanged.

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook of the United Nations* 1962, Office of Public Information, United Nations, New York, 1964, p. 494.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

Thus, the third conference stated that non-aligned countries "reaffirm and attach special importance" to the following principles: the right of the peoples to self-determination and independence, the right of all states to respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity, their right to equality and active participation in international affairs; "the right of all sovereign nations to determine, in full freedom, the paths of their internal political, economic, social and cultural development"; "the right of all peoples to the benefits of economic development and the fruits of the scientific and technological revolution"; refraining from the threat or use of force, and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.<sup>1</sup>

The sixth conference recalled the "goals and purposes of the movement which have guided it since its inception in 1961" and reaffirmed its adherence to the following principles: national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality, and the free social development of all countries; independence of non-aligned countries from Great Power or bloc rivalries and influences and opposition to participation in military pacts and alliances arising therefrom; the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism, and all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation and domination and hegemony; active peaceful co-existence among all states; indivisibility of peace and security; non-interference and non-intervention in the internal and external affairs of other countries; freedom of all states to determine their political systems and pursue economic, social and cultural development without intimidation, hindrance and pressure; establishment of a New International Economic Order and development of international cooperation on the basis of equality; the right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and alien domination and constant support to the struggle of national liberation movements; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; opposition to the division of the world into antagonistic military-political alliances and blocs and rejection of outmoded doctrines such as spheres of influence and balance of terror; permanent sovereignty over natural resources; inviolability of legally es-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 46.

tablished international boundaries; non-use of force or threat of use of force and non-recognition of situations brought about by the threat or use of force; and peaceful settlement of disputes.

The Political Declaration of the seventh conference merely reiterated adherence to the movement's principles "as defined at their summit conferences in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka, Algiers, Colombo and Havana" and also confirmed the movement's "firm adherence to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter".

The differences in content between the foregoing lists of the principles of peaceful co-existence in non-aligned documents are attributable to the fact that they contain not only the fundamental, generally recognised principles but also more concrete ones arising out of the specific character of the problems encountered by the developing countries on the international scene. The problems of safeguarding independence, eliminating economic backwardness and ensuring development, complete liquidation of colonialism, the struggle against neo-colonialism, etc., inevitably place a special stamp on both the foreign policy and diplomacy of the developing countries, the non-aligned, among them, and on the principles that express their interests. This specific feature is evident not only in the principles of the non-aligned movement but also in those of the charters of intergovernmental organisations of young countries, which have many non-aligned members. All these charters make it incumbent on members to adhere to the principles of the UN Charter, i.e. to the principles of peaceful co-existence. But they also contain particular principles. Take, for example, the charter of the largest of these organisations—the Organisation of African Unity—which includes three such principles: unreserved condemnation, in all its forms, of political assassination as well as of subversive activities on the part of neighbouring States or any other States; absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent; affirmation of a policy of non-alignment with regard to all blocs. All these three principles reflect the peculiarities of the political situation on the continent, of inter-African relations, and the stance of African states internationally in the early 1960s when the OAU Charter was adopted.

Another cause of this phenomenon is the fact that when draft political declarations are discussed at conferences each country in attendance seeks to have included principles that reflect its interests. And since consensus is the main method of decision-making in the non-aligned movement, the resultant list is often made up of unequivocal parts, with the basic, universally recognised principles of peaceful co-existence next to concrete, particular and sometimes even overlapping principles.

It is therefore obvious that at every stage of its development the legal basis of the non-aligned movement has been the code of principles of peaceful co-existence, principles which were codified in 1970 in UN General Assembly Resolution 2625/XXV entitled "Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". The non-aligned countries took a very active part in the six-year drafting of this document on the Special UN Committee, where they predominated and acted as a single group on behalf of the entire movement.

Thus, the seven principles of the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law, which are identical to those quoted above from UN General Assembly Resolution 1815/XVII of 1962 and are confirmed in the Programme for Peace and International Cooperation of the second non-aligned conference, are the core of the principles of peaceful co-existence, which, according to non-aligned documents, constitute its political and legal basis.

But, as has already been stated, the non-aligned countries themselves also include in this basis the principle of non-alignment, which therefore needs to be explained. As we have said, this concept began to emerge (it was first evident in the Bandung Declaration) on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence and was essentially their political and legal corollary in the foreign policy and diplomacy of the group of states that had in principle refused to be a part of imperialism's bloc policy.

Is it true to say that the purpose of non-alignment, and therefore also the content of non-alignment is merely non-participation in the blocs and alliances of the great powers? An affirmative answer would mean equating non-alignment with passive inaction or, at best, a defensive position. But

that is completely at odds with both the purposes of the movement and its members' adherence to the aims and principles of peaceful co-existence.

As far back as 1956, Solomon Bandaranaike, a founder of the non-aligned movement and Prime Minister of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) stated at the Eleventh UN General Assembly session during a polemic with John Foster Dulles: that neutralism "is not something dishonest; it is not a matter of sitting on the fence to see whether we can get the best of both worlds... We are supposed to be the 'uncommitted' nations. I strongly object to that word. We are committed up to the hilt. We are committed to preserve decency in dealings between nations, we are committed to the cause of justice and freedom as much as anyone is."<sup>1</sup>

When taking over as Chairman at the seventh conference, Indira Gandhi said: "Our policy will continue to be not only to keep aloof from alignments, but try to make friendly co-operation possible... Non-alignment is not vague, not negative, not neutral."<sup>2</sup>

What, then, constitutes the final aim of non-alignment, and hence of the principle of non-alignment? Jawaharlal Nehru, the "father" of non-alignment, saw the final aim as national independence. For him, given the imperialist-imposed bloc policy, non-alignment was a means of upholding the young states' independence. The meaning of non-alignment was to "remain friends with everybody and yet to advance your cause."<sup>3</sup> The Indian Prime Minister also stressed: "We propose to look after India's interests in the context of world co-operation and world peace, in so far as world peace can be preserved."<sup>4</sup>

Speaking about India's foreign policy in 1981, Indira Gandhi said that the country should remain uninvolved into confrontation of big powers for the sake of its independence; but this does not mean that India is neutral in its assessments.

This viewpoint was later reflected in a number of impor-

<sup>1</sup> *The Government and the People*. A collection of speeches made by Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Hon. S.W.R.D. Bandaranaike, 1959. Issued by the Department of Information, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *UN Document A/38/132, Appendix II, pp. 143, 144.*

<sup>3</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.



tant documents of the movement. For example, Paragraph 3 of the 1970 second conference's Declaration on Peace, Independence, Development, Cooperation and Democratization of International Relations states: "The policy of non-alignment has emerged as the result of the determination of independent countries to safeguard their national independence and the legitimate rights of their peoples."<sup>1</sup> The Political Declaration of the 1983 seventh conference made it clear that the movement regards non-alignment as "a decisive instrument for exercising their full sovereignty in political and economic matters".<sup>2</sup> Movement Chairman Indira Gandhi's aphoristic definition at that same conference was: "Non-alignment is national independence and freedom."<sup>3</sup>

Since the cardinal goal of non-alignment is independence, the movement's legal principle should contain that objective. Such an aim is indeed enshrined in the Political Declaration of the 1976 fifth conference, which stated that the non-aligned principle is one of "true independence of States, and all that it implies".<sup>4</sup>

It can therefore be said that the non-aligned principle is an international legal means of strengthening the independence of non-aligned states, a means based on the principles of peaceful co-existence. That principle says that such states have the right to ensure their independence by not joining blocs or alliances that include the great powers or have been set up against either of them, and at the same time are obliged to work actively to establish in international relations the principles of peaceful co-existence of states with different social and political systems and strictly to abide by these principles so as to strengthen international peace and security.

The non-aligned principle is an international legal attribute of the juridical status of non-alignment, which has already been defined in literature. For example, Yugoslavian non-alignment specialist Ranko Petkovic said in his book *Theoretical Concepts of Non-Alignment*: "Non-alignment is a legal status freely assumed by a state under which it undertakes the moral, political and legal commitment to ad-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 205.

here to the movement's postulates and objectives."<sup>1</sup> It is important to emphasise that in both theory and practice this status is legitimate only if it accords with the movement's political and legal basis—the principles of peaceful co-existence.

This is important because the question has correctly been raised of states' right to non-alignment, but it should be remembered that this right carries with it very precise obligations. For example, a state that has acquired that status may not be an aggressor or party to aggression (especially against a neighbouring non-aligned state) in any form envisaged by the UN's 1974 definition of aggression, including supporting or arming bands to be sent into a neighbouring country.

The non-alignment principle means rights and obligations not only for a given non-aligned country but also for other countries, including non-members of the movement, for which these rights and obligations may appear not on the basis of that principle but because of their rights and obligations under the universally recognised principles of peaceful co-existence and their connection with the non-aligned principle. Thus, in the example given above, a non-member of the movement which has acquired such a status does not have the right to encourage a non-aligned country by any means to breach the non-aligned principle, for the former would thereby be breaching the principles of peaceful co-existence; in particular a non-member does not have the right to instigate a member to undertake such aggression or to draw it into participation in it either through a direct treaty of alliance or an agreement on unjustifiably large military deliveries, training of groups of saboteurs, etc.

Of course, the rights and obligations of a non-participant in the movement with respect to the non-aligned principle could also arise on the basis of its contractual obligation to respect the non-alignment of the other party.

The universally recognised principles of peaceful co-existence and the non-aligned principle based on them make up what is known as the non-aligned principles.

Unfortunately, there are quite a few members which breach the principles and status of non-alignment. Imperial-

<sup>1</sup> Ranko Petkovic, *Teorijski Pojmovi Neutralnosti*, Izdavacka Radna Organizacija "RAD", Beograd, 1982.

ism, especially US imperialism, actively encourages this by instigating conflicts between non-aligned countries.

The course of the socialist community, including the USSR, is a completely opposite one. The Soviet leadership constantly shows in words and deeds that the Soviet Union is consistent in its efforts for peaceful co-existence. In March 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed the readiness of the USSR to maintain goodneighbourly relations with all countries on the principles of peaceful co-existence, on the basis of equality and mutually advantageous cooperation. The relations between the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, and the non-aligned countries rest fully on peaceful co-existence. The socialist states realise that the two groups of countries have a common approach to the main problems of world politics based on a common interest in strengthening the peaceful co-existence of states with different social and political systems. This common approach and this basis constitute the historical objective foundation of the unity of action of the two groups of states on the international scene and explains why a number of states are members of both groups simultaneously.

Supporting the liberated and non-aligned countries and seeking to strengthen peaceful co-existence and its principles, the Soviet Union proposes that the great powers be guided by certain principles in their relations with those countries. For example, Mikhail Gorbachev has said that the permanent UN Security Council members should undertake strictly to abide by the principles of non-interference and non-use or threat of force in their relations with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and not to involve them in military blocs. The Soviet Union is prepared to assume such undertakings. That is fully in keeping with our foreign policy principles.

Based on their collective conclusion, outlined in their joint Declaration of 16 June 1984, that the non-aligned movement is now a powerful factor of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. At their 1986 meeting, the Warsaw Treaty states took note of the non-aligned movement's growing role as a major factor of international relations.

There is therefore good reason why, as is shown in a num-

ber of chapters of this book, the two groups of states have long been cooperating in the international arena to further peaceful co-existence of states with different systems, insuring international peace and security. Let us touch on another form of their cooperation in this area.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have always believed that one of the most reliable methods of establishing the principles of peaceful co-existence in international relations is to formalise them in the form of international treaties which are legally binding. This position is shared by large non-aligned countries, India among them.

Both groups have always been of the view that this can and should be done even though military groupings exist, and that such treaties should in fact also be concluded between states belonging to opposed alliances. The readiness of the USSR and some other European socialist countries to act in this direction was demonstrated by the series of historic treaties and declarations of the early 1970s with the USA, the FRG, France and Britain, treaties and declarations which confirmed the parties' adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence.

At the same time, the socialist countries' political treaties with non-aligned states naturally rest on a different basis and have a much deeper content, as is evident from their official name—"treaties on friendship and cooperation". The first one was concluded in 1960 between Czechoslovakia and the Yemen Arab Republic. Since then all socialist countries have signed such treaties with non-aligned states, their number now exceeding 50. The Soviet Union has been concluding treaties of friendship and cooperation since 1971 and now has such treaties with ten non-aligned (non-socialist) countries.

What are these treaties like? They not only reiterate adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems but enshrine their undertaking to work to establish these principles in world politics. Speaking about the USSR's first such treaty with India, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi said that "the 1971 treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation is a reflection of our profound mutual respect and serves the cause of peace". That this treaty is an effective legal basis for relations between the two countries is evident in sphere of their domestic and

international life, which is why, as the joint 1985 Soviet-Indian declaration stated, "the parties believe that relations between the USSR and India demonstrate the fruitfulness of ties between states with different socio-economic systems if they adhere to the principles of peaceful co-existence, equality and mutual respect, strict observance of sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs."

Furthermore, it is important to note that these treaties provide for both an organisational (consultations, joint commissions) and a legal (statements by the parties that they do not and will not have legal commitments directed against each other) mechanism to further ensure that their mutual relations and relations with others are based on the principles of peaceful co-existence.

It is obvious that the very fact that a number of non-aligned countries have such active treaty-based relations with socialist community countries has led to international recognition of them and of the movement itself as a whole as a real factor of the struggle for peaceful co-existence, peace and security.

These treaties have yet another feature that is equally important from the viewpoint of world politics. The socialist side recognises the policy of non-alignment and undertakes to respect it and the non-aligned status of the other side. This is of even greater significance where the socialist country is a Warsaw Treaty member for this means, on the one hand, recognition of the peaceable, defensive character of the Warsaw Treaty, whose members have solemnly declared on more than one occasion that they are prepared to disband their organisation simultaneously with NATO, and, on the other, recognition of the reality of non-alignment as a peace-promoting factor of world politics. This feature is of particular international political significance when such treaties are concluded by the Soviet Union—a big power and also a member of one of the main military groupings in the modern world. First, because justice is thereby done to the USSR's role as a bulwark of peace, its role in the struggle for peaceful co-existence; second, because this country, which has a decisive say in world politics, thereby gives obvious political and legal backing to the non-aligned movement in international relations. This latter aspect has been written about in the non-aligned countries themselves. For

example, Indian-Soviet foreign policy specialist Imam wrote in 1981 that never before had the Soviet Union concluded such wide-ranging treaties except with socialist countries; that all these treaties include a provision on respect for non-alignment and oblige the USSR to support the policy of non-alignment pursued by the other parties to those treaties, and that this can only be seen as an attempt on the part of the USSR to institutionalise non-alignment in world politics.

All that has been said about the non-aligned principle makes possible the conclusion that it has yet another important element, namely, the obligation of non-aligned countries to cooperate fully with all peace-loving forces to strengthen peace and security, and to establish the principles of peaceful co-existence in international relations. This obligation stems, first, from the universally recognised principle of modern international relations of fulfilling in good faith the international undertakings assumed under the UN Charter. As was already noted, the non-aligned countries worked actively to have this principle codified in the 1970 UN Declaration on the Principles of International Law.

But this obligation also stems from the decisions of the movement's Conferences, the first of which (1961) declared that the participants sincerely desire to cooperate with any government that seeks to strengthen trust and peace throughout the world. This point has been repeated in other important documents of the movement, including the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference.

The treaties on friendship and cooperation concluded with socialist countries were in fact the international legal embodiment of this aspect of the non-aligned principle by the non-aligned countries involved. It may therefore be said that the non-aligned principle is also an international legal expression of the anti-war, anti-imperialist and anti-colonial unity of non-aligned countries with other peace-loving states, including those of the socialist community.

Underlying this characterisation of the non-aligned principle is the common adherence of non-aligned countries and countries of the socialist community to the policy and principles of peaceful co-existence as the only possible alternative to a global nuclear holocaust.

Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Colonialism—  
the Main Direction of the  
Non-Aligned Movement

The non-aligned movement came into being primarily as a movement which rejected the imperialist-imposed “rules of the game”, i.e. economic sanctions, ideological subversion, provocation of conflicts, local wars, and the knocking together of military blocs as an instrument of their aggressive policy against the national liberation and revolutionary movements.

In spite of the differences in the independence struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America at various stages of the national liberation movements, a struggle which included both peaceful and non-peaceful means, the principal objective remained the same—to get rid of foreign domination and oppression. The common historical fate of the Afro-Asian peoples at the time of the anti-colonial revolutions brought them closer together and gave them a political and ideological understanding of their role in the fight against the position of “colonial backyards” in which imperialism wanted to keep them. During those years the leaders of the national liberation movements established broad contacts and relations of solidarity and support between themselves and with other revolutionary forces of Europe and America, attended international forums, and absorbed revolutionary ideas. One such important meeting was the February 1927 Brussels Congress of Oppressed Nationalities, which was attended by 37 countries, among them countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Jawaharlal Nehru, who represented the Indian National Congress at the Brussels meeting, later recalled that “it was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism”.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Jawaharlal Nehru, An Autobiography*, Allied Publishers Private Limited, Bombay, New Delhi, Calcutta, Madras, 1962, p. 161.

The anti-colonial revolutions brought the peoples fighting for freedom closer together on a broad anti-imperialist platform, whose basis was the struggle against a common enemy. Anti-imperialism acquired qualitatively new features in the epoch of the collapse of the colonial system. A document of the 1947 Delhi Asian Relations Conference stated that imperialism should never have a place in Asia.<sup>1</sup>

The emergent states countered the policy of domination and subjection with non-alignment with the military-political groupings and non-participation in the Western powers' cold war. As was stated in Chapters 1 and 2, the Bandung Conference of Heads of State or Government of Asia and Africa advanced a wide-ranging programme for democratising international relations, a programme which reflected the qualitatively new elements of the anti-imperialist trend of the young national states.

There is good ground for saying that when the non-aligned movement was formed the newly-independent states already had more or less clearly formulated principles of their international policy which had arisen out of their long, hard anti-imperialist struggle both before and after their political independence.

The young countries opposed imperialism's united onslaught with the unity, cohesion, will and aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America expressed in the Political Declaration of the first conference. The document stated that during the transition from an old order based on domination to a new order based on cooperation, freedom, equality and social justice, when the dynamic processes and forms of social change often result in conflict between the old-established and the new emerging nationalist forces, a lasting peace can be achieved only if this confrontation leads to a world where colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations are radically eliminated.

Imperialism's attempts to ignore or belittle the historical significance of the non-aligned movement and its clear anti-imperialist platform ended in failure, as did the undermining of the movement "from the left" by those forces which sought to discredit the principles of peaceful co-existence,

<sup>1</sup> *Asian Relations Organisation*, New Delhi, 1948, p. 81.



replace anti-imperialist struggle with preparations for a new world war, and isolate the national liberation movements from the other revolutionary forces of the day.

A glaring manifestation of military pressure was the American aggression in Indo-China, which aimed not only to suppress the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea but also to involve neighbouring countries in the conflict. A tense situation was also created in western Asia by the Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples. Imperialism's repeated attacks against the Arab national liberation movement negatively affected not only the countries directly concerned but the entire Arab world and other regions of Asia and Africa, and also the Mediterranean.

The imperialist powers made broad use of military-political alliances (e.g. SEATO, CENTO) in their aggressive actions against the peoples of Indo-China and the Arab countries. The US regarded them as a means to realise their hegemonistic plans and sought, along with its NATO partners, to use them to drive a wedge between the national liberation movement and world socialism, to isolate and divide the peoples asserting their independence, sow hostility and distrust among them and thereby weaken their rebuff to colonialism.

However, these plans were never realised. By the mid-1960s world socialism had not only secured its existence but was having an increasing positive impact on the objective processes throughout the world, making the collapse of imperialism's colonial system irreversible.

The Suez (1956) and Caribbean (1962) crises and the events in Northern Africa showed that imperialism could not suppress the national liberation movement through direct military clashes. The socialist states directed all their might and political influence toward preserving and enhancing international security, understanding that it was necessary resolutely to eliminate all manifestations of colonialism and racial discrimination, which have always created conflicts and tension.

The organisational restructuring of the movement and the setting up of coordinating bodies did much to intensify the anti-neocolonialist struggle by making it possible considerably to invigorate the movement's activity, to react more promptly to changes and take quick agreed decisions, for

example on the acute problems of the Middle East, South Africa, Indo-China, the Indian Ocean and Chile, decisions that helped to step up member countries' struggle against specific actions by the imperialist powers which ran counter to the fundamental political, social and economic interests of the newly-independent states.

The ideals of the anti-imperialist, national liberation struggle were reflected in the basic documents of the movement. Thus, the fourth conference of non-aligned countries, which took place in Algiers in 1973, was the first to be held as international tension eased after the long years of the cold war. Far from cooling down the national liberation struggle, the improved political climate created more favourable conditions for championing the peoples' freedom and independence.

The Political Declaration of the Algiers conference noted that the non-aligned movement had undergone severe trials in the hard struggle against the enemies of peace, national independence and progress and had gained high international prestige and become an influential political force of our time.

At the Algiers conference, the non-aligned movement for the first time summarised and clearly outlined its economic objectives and the long-term political tasks connected with them. The Economic Declaration said that "imperialism is still the greatest stumbling bloc to the emancipation and advancement of developing countries... Imperialism is not only opposed to the economic and social progress of developing countries but has also adopted an aggressive attitude towards those who stand in the way of its designs and seeks to impose political, social and economic structures which facilitate foreign domination, dependence or neo-colonialism."<sup>1</sup>

The fifth conference, held in Colombo in 1976, marked an important stage in the movement's activity. Its documents fully supported the historic victory of the Vietnamese people, the gaining of freedom by the peoples of Laos and Kampuchea, the Angolan people's successful rebuff to the onslaught of the united forces of imperialism and racism and their accomplices, and the broadening of the liberation

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 99.

struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and other colonial countries.

As the USA launched its anti-detente policy, the Political Declaration of the 1979 Havana conference reiterated that the movement's essential objectives were still "elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism, including Zionism" and "support to national liberation movements struggling against colonial and alien domination and foreign occupation."<sup>1</sup> The conference focussed on the final liquidation of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, and made a profound and thorough analysis of the results achieved by the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the struggle against them. The conference hailed the countries that had gained independence since the last conference and noted that the "imperialists have continued to react to the victories of the liberation struggle by a policy designed to maintain their interests in areas that have not yet attained independence"<sup>2</sup>, especially in southern Africa. Special attention was paid in this connection to Namibia. The Havana conference praised the efforts of the non-aligned countries, the UN, the OAU, the socialist countries and other progressive forces to liberate the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, pointing out that the main reason for the survival of colonialism and racism was the military, technological, economic, political, diplomatic and other forms of aid that imperialism gives the racist regimes.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the struggle for political independence and sovereignty has always been the pivot of the movement's anti-imperialist policy. As the colonial system collapsed, the directions of the non-aligned states' struggle diversified, this tendency becoming especially pronounced in the 1970s.

A process of detente began in the 1970s and was primarily manifested in a reduction in the danger of a new world war, gradual settlement of acute international crises and conflicts, and many-sided and mutually advantageous co-operation between countries with different social systems on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence. By pooling their efforts, the peace-loving forces succeeded in

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, op. cit., p. 403.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 406.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 407.

breaking the tragic cycle of poisoning of the international atmosphere and forcing the warmongers to retreat. A reflection of this was the whole system of treaties which defined the necessary legal bases for making the principles of peaceful co-existence universal.

Detente was greatly furthered by the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which confirmed the inviolability of the post-war international borders, elaborated a code of principles for relations between the 35 countries represented, and outlined the prospects for peaceful longterm cooperation. The conference's Final Act included a wide-ranging programme for improving the political climate in the world. The non-aligned countries regarded this meeting as a step forward in establishing equal cooperation and easing international tension.

Detente enabled the national liberation forces to score fresh major victories. Imperialism's attempt to crush the socialist state and the national liberation revolution in Indo-China by military means, the most large-scale attempt since the Second World War, met with total failure. In the front-line of the forces of peace and social progress in Southeast Asia, socialist Vietnam triumphed and became firmly established. The people of Laos embarked on a road of freedom and socialism, and the criminal Pol Pot-Yeng Sari regime in Kampuchea was toppled. The radical change in the situation in Indo-China did much to improve the political situation throughout the Asian continent.

Almost simultaneously, the Portuguese colonial empire—the last in the world—collapsed, and Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and other countries joined the ranks of independent states. These changes gave a fresh impetus to the peoples of southern Africa in their fight against colonialism and racism.

The popular revolutions in non-aligned Ethiopia, Afghanistan and Nicaragua dealt a powerful blow at imperialism and proved that reliance on dictatorial regimes to maintain domination is a bankrupt policy. The revolution in Iran was another major defeat. SEATO and CENTO crumbled. The struggle of the peoples of the East acquired social content. Experience was showing conclusively that detente was going hand in hand with invigoration of the anti-imperialist struggle on every front.

It is highly significant that it was under conditions of détente that the non-aligned countries demanded a restructuring of the entire old structure of economic relations and a new world economic order. The new community of developing countries known as the Group of 77 was a direct result of the activity of the non-aligned movement. Chapter 6 will deal in greater detail with the close cooperation between the movement and the Group of 77, which resulted in a non-aligned economic programme that is decidedly anti-imperialist and defends the economic interests of the non-aligned (and primarily the developing) countries. Here it is enough to note that the anti-imperialist trend of the non-aligned countries' course toward economic independence meets their vital national interests.

Running counter to the objective bases of this course and to these national interests are the theses and concepts about "rich" and "poor" countries, the "backward South" and the "developed North", and "equal responsibility" of all the great powers for the non-aligned countries' economic difficulties.

This latter thesis is nowhere near the truth and is by no means supported by everyone. In its 4 October 1976 statement "On Restructuring International Economic Relations", the Soviet government demolished such assertions: "There are no grounds, nor could there be, for the developing countries to lay to the Soviet Union and other socialist states the claims which they lay to the developed capitalist states, including the claim for mandatory transfer to the developing countries of a fixed share of the gross national product as economic aid.

"First, these states are not to blame for the developing countries' economic backwardness, which is a legacy of their colonial past.

"Second, they have never exploited any country economically.

"Third, the socialist countries have nothing to do with the grave consequences for the developing countries of the economic crises, financial collapse and other manifestations of the anarchy of production in the capitalist system.

"The Soviet Union is a state of working people where there are no parasitic classes making profits and superprofits of the exploitation of their peoples or the peoples of other states.

“The socialist states’ aid to the developing countries is not compensation for damage done nor atonement for past sins: it is the assistance of a friend and ally in the struggle against a common enemy—imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. Were it not for the Soviet Union, socialism and its reliable support, imperialism would have nipped in the bud all attempts by the now free states to achieve genuine national independence.”<sup>1</sup>

It is the monopolist circles of the capitalist states that have always been the main roadblock to a radical restructuring of international economic relations. “Imperialism, however, is determined not to give up its positions in the non-aligned world,” wrote A. Chand, an eminent Indian political scientist. “To this end it is changing its tactics, searching for more subtle forms of exploitation of the peoples of newly-independent countries.”<sup>2</sup>

Today, when the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America face the immense tasks of socio-economic change to eliminate backwardness, poverty, hunger and disease, a general international climate that would enable them to focus on these problems is of paramount importance.

As Robert Mugabe pointed out at the eighth conference in 1986, world military spending has reached \$2 billion per minute. “Only one-fifth of arms expenditure in just one year could wipe out the scourge of world hunger by the year 2000.”<sup>3</sup>

Events of recent years show that as the global arms race intensifies, it increasingly and more directly involves developing countries in the general process of militarisation, to a considerable extent encourages mini-arms races, and gives rise to dangerous contradictions between those countries, aggravating an already complicated international situation.

The reversal of detente has drawn the liberated countries more into conflicts and hiked their military spending, which increased from \$27.8 billion in 1970 to over \$125 billion in 1982. In 1982, the developing countries accounted for 16% of total world military spending (compared with 7.2% in

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 5 October 1976.

<sup>2</sup> Attar Chand, *Non-aligned States: A Great Leap Forward. A Study on New International Economic Order*, UDH Publishers, Delhi, 1983, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> *UN Document A/41/697*, 14 October 1986, p. 309.

1970) and the share of this spending (5.9%) in their GNP was greater than that of the developed countries. The armies of the newly-free states comprise 15 million servicemen or 60% of the world total. These countries now absorb almost 75% of world arms imports.

It is the regions that are already explosive which import the most arms. According to SIPRI, between 1978 and 1982 military spending increased by \$18 billion in the Middle East, \$12 billion in the Far East (excluding China), \$8 billion in South Africa, and \$7.5 billion in Latin America, i.e. by a total of \$50 billion.

What does the burden of military spending mean for the developing countries? Such spending by young states has a substantially greater element of "lost possibilities" than does that of the developed countries. It is true to say that the less developed the economic and industrial base, the heavier the burden of formally equal (as a proportion of GNP) military spending, the more disastrous the impact on the national economy, for in that case military spending is a direct deduction from an already low share of accumulation. High rates of military preparations in the developing countries are causing economic stagnation, which is extremely difficult to remedy.

So-called "aid" from the West—credits and loans—is an important means of exerting neocolonial pressure on the non-aligned countries. While the developing countries' total international debt stood at \$33 billion in 1974, it reached the astronomical figure of more than \$1,000 billion in 1986. The transition to monetary-fiscal methods of exploiting the developing world considerably diminishes the prospects for their socio-economic development. The main form of exploitation in the past—direct private investment—remains as draconian as ever. Thus, the US Department of Commerce reports that direct private US investment abroad amounted to \$221 billion at the end of 1982 and yielded profits of approximately \$20 billion in 1983. The Middle East and Asia are the most profitable regions, with average profit levels in the former exceeding 44%, which is roughly five times what they are in Europe, for example.

The USA and the other imperialist powers think of political as well as economic gain when they render "aid", so that this "aid" is more often than not directly or indirectly

linked with military or economic demands.

An important feature of non-aligned policy in the period under consideration is less emphasis on national liberation and more on creating the necessary external political conditions for social development, a change which actually signifies a further deepening of the anti-imperialist content of non-aligned policy.

The turn of the 1980s saw fierce resistance by imperialism to this policy, events showing that imperialism is anything but a time-server. International tension heightened in the early 1980s as a direct consequence of the sharp escalation in the adventurist course of the imperialist powers, the US first and foremost. They responded to the defeats on social questions at home, the loss of their colonial possessions, the removal of more and more countries from the capitalist path, and the further successes of the national liberation struggle by stepping up military preparations, creating new seats of tension and actively attempting to revive the cold-war atmosphere and return to the doctrine of "rolling back socialism" and to military suppression of the national liberation movement.

It was in precisely that period that right-wing militarist and revanchist forces of the monopolist bourgeoisie came to power in the USA, the FRG, Britain and Japan. The economic base of the monopolist bourgeoisie is formed by the military industrial complex and the transnational corporations, which are increasingly becoming the dominant force in the world capitalist economy.

It is therefore essentially fully to appreciate the immense danger facing all humanity. The objective basis for the militarist foreign policy of American imperialism and NATO, which have been destabilising the strategic situation and thereby heightening the danger of a thermonuclear holocaust, lies precisely in the very essence of the evolution of state monopoly capitalism in both basis and superstructure.

A greater historical responsibility than ever before therefore rests on all progressive peace-loving forces that oppose imperialism, want to restructure the entire system of international relations on a peaceful and democratic basis, and uphold the sovereign right of every people to be master of its own fate and freely to choose its own path of development.



The advent of the Reagan administration brought a dangerous change in US policy toward the non-aligned movement. It has been altered more than once but has invariably remained hostile to the movement. As stated earlier, the US and the West on the whole ignored the non-aligned movement at the first stages of its development and then launched an open political offensive against it "from a position of strength". While pursuing a "time-serving" strategy, the USA and its NATO partners sought to identify any coincidence of interests between themselves and the non-aligned countries, to back "those countries' resolve to maintain their independence from both East and West", and to "sustain moderate pro-Western regimes in those countries". Underlying this strategy were plans to direct the non-aligned countries' desire to maintain their independence within the framework of a "philosophical and ideological alliance with the West against the communist bloc". An important element was the West's recognition of the movement as a new world centre of strength.

This practical departure from a strategy of open hostility toward the non-aligned movement had a definite objective, namely to use calls for "genuine non-alignment" and "equidistance" from East and West to move the emergent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America away from active anti-imperialist struggle, and to push them from positive non-aligned to so-called intermediate development. This tactical manoeuvre was combined with the traditional imperialist policy of violence and aggression, frontal blows at the left wing of the national liberation movement, and active subversion against the progressive regimes. Political blackmail and economic pressure were also employed, including the "aid" mechanism. With the reversal of detente, policy-making and academic circles in the West are proposing to bring concentrated pressure to bear on the non-aligned movement using new ideological, political, economic and military means.

Imperialist propaganda has revived the stale thesis about the "collapse of non-alignment" which says, first, that the movement emerged as the newly-independent countries' joint action against colonialism alone and that since anti-colonialism has become a "dead dogma" now that the decolonisation process has been completed, the movement is in "decay"; second, that recent "insurmountable difficulties"

like the Iran-Iraq conflict are evidence that the movement has become "powerless and therefore useless". The political bias of such assertions is only too obvious.

The "collapse of non-alignment" thesis aims to replace non-alignment with the concept of regionalism—the creation of regional world structures on a global integrated level—and to get the young national states to unite within "regional bodies" like the OAU or ASEAN as the only step allegedly enabling them to take a "worthy" place in the world.

However, in recent years Western strategists and politicians, especially in the White House, have been increasingly inclined to think and act in terms of "forcibly" influencing events in the non-aligned zone, to move to a policy of military neo-colonialism. Pursuing the force-reliant strategy, correcting "destabilising factors", and attempting to resolve conflicts militarily based on the concepts of "controlling" conflicts in the national liberation zone has been elevated to the rank of open official US policy underlying the American approach to non-alignment.

Washington has openly adopted a strategy of "direct confrontation" whose principal objective is described in the US Defense Department's "Fiscal Year 1984-1988 Defense Guidance" as the elimination of socialism as a socio-political system. This end, which is actually US world domination, is to be achieved primarily by using a wide range of military methods.

A specific feature of Washington's strategy is that the material preparations for a war against the USSR and the rest of the socialist community is by no means limited to the territory of US and NATO allies. The crusade against communism is not mere rhetoric: it is a kind of manifesto of world-wide counterrevolution. The US administration would like to turn the Asian continent, on which a third of the non-aligned countries are located, into the eastern front of struggle against the socialist states and other progressive regimes. Imperialist propaganda tries to use the fabricated "Soviet military threat" to cover up its plans to make the non-aligned Asian countries objects of a military and political confrontation and also its large-scale military preparations.

However, the bulk of non-aligned countries reject this myth and are increasingly convinced of the USA's striving

for world domination, manifested, for example, in the invasion of Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, and support for the anti-popular regimes in El Salvador, Chile and countries of Asia and Africa. Washington labels as "Russian subversion" all actions by the young countries which are at odds with US hegemonistic policy. At the same time it tries to make use of NATO, which from its inception was directed not only against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries but also against the national liberation forces. In 1952 NATO set up a committee to effect an economic blockade of China. NATO troops fought in the war on the Korean Peninsula when American imperialism was attempting to revenge its defeat in China. Washington is presently seeking to enhance NATO influence in the Far East and in Asia as a whole.

Under a security treaty between the USA and Japan, agreement was reached in July 1976 to set up a joint consultative mechanism for military cooperation, including general strategy in the event of hostilities. This new body was also to look into the question of US armed forces making permanent use of American military bases in Japan.

In the past few years the Tokyo ruling quarters have been seeking to bring Japan's international role in line with its economic might, thereby making the foreign policy of this country, which is a Western power centre, a global one.

The non-aligned countries of Asia and other continents are naturally worried by the fact that the Pentagon currently has in Japan about 120 bases and other military installations where almost 50,000 soldiers and officers are stationed, and that, in the words of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, Japan and the USA enjoy a "special alliance". The non-aligned countries see that Japan's ruling quarters have been doing Washington's bidding by speeding up the accumulation of "self-defence forces". Japanese observers themselves estimate that the size of their land troops is now comparable with that of the British army. Japan's air force holds sixth place among the USA's 15 NATO allies, its submarine fleet—fifth place, and its navy—fourth in tonnage.

A Japanese general has admitted that major Japanese firms have been developing new types of weapons. A joint American-Japanese commission on strategy has been considering different scenarios for deploying US cruise missiles,

and planning and conducting joint American-Japanese manoeuvres. American nuclear submarines and ships are allowed to call at Japanese ports.

The force-reliant US military strategy is one of turning Japan and all of eastern Asia into a site for deployment of American nuclear forward-based weapons. As it is in Western Europe, the aim is to bring nuclear first-strike weapons closer to Soviet territory and to use US allies as lightning conductors that will attract any nuclear retaliation.

The US policy of reviving Japanese militarism and turning Japan into a military power runs counter to the aspirations of the non-aligned countries; it is also a direct threat for non-aligned Asian countries, and is destabilising the situation in the region.

The Pentagon's plans cast Japan in the role of a very important US base for its military and naval activity in Asia and the Pacific, and for implementation of American nuclear strategy in the region. To this end, Washington and Tokyo have been increasingly taking steps to expand the sphere of operation of their bilateral "security treaty" (Japan's undertaking to participate with the USA in patrolling the lanes over a 1,000-mile zone from the Japanese islands; Tokyo's preparations for a possible blocking of international straits, etc.), which poses a grave danger for the non-aligned states in the Asian and Pacific zone. Although the Japanese government has proclaimed "three non-nuclear principles" (not to have, produce or allow the importation of nuclear weapons), Japan, including the island of Okinawa—one of the largest US bases in the region—is beginning to play the role of a US nuclear bridgehead. An evidence to this are the following facts: Tokyo's agreement to the deployment of American nuclear-capable B-16 bombers on Japanese territory; the installation of cruise missiles on the US Seventh Fleet, which is stationed in Japan; and the more frequent reports of American nuclear ships and submarines calling at Japanese ports.

Having for all intents and purposes become NATO's far eastern flank, Japan is being gradually drawn into Washington's bloc policy in the Asian and Pacific region. The non-aligned countries cannot but be worried over Japan's "quiet crawling" into the process of knocking together militarist axes and triangle like the Washington-Tokyo-Seoul bloc.

South Korea has not been allowed to join the non-aligned movement, and the fact that the USA is now trying to use that country as an "advance bridgehead", a "foothold on the continent", and a "frontline state" is destabilising the situation in the region. The presence in the country of a 40,000-strong American corps, several dozen foreign military bases and fortified regions, and almost a thousand nuclear weapon units not only impedes the peaceful unification of the two parts of the country but also the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, the dissolving of the UN Command, and the dismantling of all foreign military bases and other military installations, as is advocated by non-aligned countries.

As has already been said, the main non-aligned principle is non-participation in militarist blocs and alliances, but the USA's present bloc policy in the region with Japan's active involvement has the far-reaching aim of establishing an "Asian and Pacific community" into which Washington would like also to lure some non-aligned Southeast-Asian countries. The attempts to give this community a military and political bias under pretexts of security arouse the suspicions of Asian non-aligned countries, including ASEAN members, which Washington wants to cast in the role of a "link" in the US military infrastructure from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean and on to the Persian Gulf, Southwest and Southern Asia, and East Africa.

The Subic Bay and Clark Field naval and air force bases in the Philippines are key elements of the force-reliant US military strategy in Southeast Asia, and together with the bases in Japan serve as trampolines for the American rapid deployment forces. Backed by Britain and Japan, the US has been seeking to oppose ASEAN to the Indo-China countries, to make this regional organisation primarily a military and political one, and to undermine the efforts of the non-aligned countries to make the region a zone of peace and co-operation.

ASEAN holds "joint seminars" on military matters which are regarded as coordination of pooled military efforts, draws up plans to standardise the armament of the bloc's countries, and discusses joint construction of military enterprises. Military spending has been increasing, totalling \$6.5 billion in the 1982/83 fiscal year. A sizable part goes to pay

for American military deliveries, which have gone up by 150% over the past five years and now exceed \$3 billion. Much effort has been made by the USA and its allies to destabilise the situation in Southern Asia with the aim of using Pakistan to pressure peace-loving India and turning the former into a bridgehead for the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Furthermore, Pakistan is to be included in plans for more large-scale military pressure, to which end the US intends permanently to station military personnel on Pakistan territory. The US has been actively implementing its \$3.2 billion "aid" package to Pakistan, making deliveries of F-16 fighters, sea-based missiles, tanks, and heavy weapons. Yet Pakistan has been a non-aligned member since 1979.

The American strategists have been trying to reach agreement with the Bangladesh military administration to turn the port of Chittagong into a US base in the Bengali Bay and to set up American military bases on the islands of St. Martin and Mangshur, which are located in that gulf. Similar efforts are being made to get the Sri Lankan government to agree to a US military base in the port of Trincomalee.

Covert intervention and close contacts between the American special services and extremist separatists in the Punjab and the Indian northeast are among the other means being used to destabilise the situation in the region, particularly in India.

Destabilisation of the situation in India also includes support for forces which are opposed to the central government and have been given the dual role of, first, allying with the separatists and supporting the idea of dividing India and, second, forming a so-called alternative government should the attempt at division fail.

Militarisation of the Indian Ocean, which is part and parcel of the Reagan administration's global strategy, is an important aspect of the plans to destabilise the general situation in South Asia and to acquire new military bases in coastal states.

Ever since the 1960s, the US has gradually and in a planned way escalated its permanent military presence in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf, endangering the peace and security of the roughly 40 non-aligned states located there.

The non-aligned countries have for many years been

working to defuse the explosive situation in the Middle East, where world imperialism, in league with Israel and local reaction, have been provoking protracted military conflicts and political clashes.

For all the differences between the Middle-East situation and that which existed in Vietnam, they have one common feature, namely that the conflicts were aggravated by imperialism's desire to suppress the peoples' national liberation movement and prevent their progressive development. Events in Lebanon show that imperialism is increasingly provoking internecine conflicts between the Arabs. In league with the Israeli aggressors, the USA has resorted to colonialism's traditional divide-and-rule tactic, using and fostering inter-Arab contradictions in an effort to achieve what could not be achieved by force. That is precisely the objective of American "shuttle diplomacy" which is supposed "gradually to settle the Mid-East crisis".

The most glaring example of this policy was the Sinai agreement between Egypt and Israel, which left the greater part of the Peninsula occupied. The separate US-aided talks with Israel ended with the Camp David accord, which greatly harmed the Arab peoples' anti-imperialist unity and erected fresh obstacles to a Mid-East settlement.

Throughout its existence, the non-aligned movement has assisted the liberation forces of southern Africa, where international imperialism is most open in its bitter opposition to the fighting peoples. The Western powers, the US above all, give all-round aid to the racist Pretoria regime, which they need to counter the liberation struggle of the peoples of Africa. The Reagan Administration has openly declared that South Africa is its "historical ally" and, along with other Western countries, continues to defy the non-aligned and UN decisions banning materiel deliveries to the apartheid regime. Relying on the West's powerful support, Pretoria has been impeding the decolonisation of Namibia and doing everything to delay indefinitely the plan for its peaceful transition to independence. The apartheid regime flagrantly violates the state sovereignty and territorial integrity of the frontline states—Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana, and Zimbabwe. The South African racists are bent on maintaining instability in the region. They carry out acts of aggression against Angola and Mozambique, sup-

port anti-government bands, train and equip the terrorists from the so-called Mozambique national resistance, knock together subversive groups for operations against Zimbabwe, and are waging war against the patriots of occupied Namibia.

Western powers also partner the racists in exploiting the peoples of South Africa and are active in plundering the wealth of that land. NATO states have hundreds of companies operating in South Africa, among them 350 daughter companies of the 500 largest US corporations.

The non-aligned movement supports the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean, a struggle which is complicated by US aggression, intrigues and threats. The peoples of the region are striving to defeat the policy of wars, intervention and state terrorism that is a reflection of the hegemonistic ambitions of the US, which lays claim to "leadership" of the Western hemisphere. President Reagan outlined the hegemonistic aims of his imperial policy when he addressed the Organisation of American States in February 1982: "The Caribbean region is a vital strategic and commercial artery for the United States. Nearly half of our trade, two-thirds of our imported oil, and over half of our imported strategic minerals pass through the Panama Canal or the Gulf of Mexico."<sup>1</sup> US imperialism therefore wants to check the growing national liberation movement in Latin America at any cost. It still nurtures plans to liquidate the socialist gains in Cuba and stifle the Nicaraguan revolution. American imperialism directs an army of killers in El Salvador and carries out naked aggression against the people of that country. The armed intervention of Grenada, a tiny non-aligned state, and the installation of an occupation regime there were part and parcel of the policy of escalating armed intervention in the affairs of other states. Washington rejects the initiatives of the Contadora group of Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama, which aim at a political settlement of the situation in the Central American region.

Non-aligned forums have repeatedly condemned American imperialism's policy in relation to Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada, its support for the bloody regimes in El Salvador,

<sup>1</sup> *US Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. 82, No. 2061, April 1982, p. 2.



Guatemala and Honduras, breach of the Panama Canal treaties, refusal to recognise the right of the Puerto Rican people to independence, and its open support for Britain which intended, by using arms, to maintain Falkland Islands' (Malvinas) colonial status.

An analysis of international events, the national liberation struggle, and non-aligned activity in the 1980s shows that imperialism, American imperialism first and foremost, has been trying to reverse detente and destabilise the political situation in the world since the Reagan Administration came to power. In an effort to tilt the military strategy parity in its favour, the US would like to dictate to other countries and peoples by relying on military force. Washington's hegemonistic ambitions condition its global strategy of military and political confrontation with the world of socialism and the national liberation and revolutionary movement. As part of this strategy, American imperialism seeks at any cost to prevent the self-determination of the newly-independent countries and to deny them the right to overcome backwardness and dependence, the right to pursue their own independent policy of peace and progress.

The historical conditions of the post-war development of international relations in the zone of the national liberation struggle and in the world as a whole predetermined the great importance of the non-aligned movement, which has become an active political force of our time that invariably takes anti-imperialist and anti-neocolonial positions and advocates peace and international cooperation.

The joint actions of the non-aligned countries in line with their principles and goals were made appreciably more complicated at the turn of the 1980s when imperialism again heightened the war danger and world reaction launched a broad offensive in the hope of regaining lost positions, including in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In all this, US imperialism remains the principal neocolonial force and the main enemy of the liberation movement. The present world situation shows conclusively that the new American Administration's sharp turn toward reversal of detente is closely connected with the colonial revanche which imperialism has been trying to take on the national liberation movement, particularly since the major defeats of the 1970s, when the liquidation of the colonial empires was virtually completed

and a number of young national states carried out profound progressive changes.

The policy of reversing detente is to the advantage of those forces which want to destabilise the international situation, restore the colonial and neocolonial orders, and weaken the national liberation movement. Features of imperialism's present strategy and policy of neocolonialism in relation to the non-aligned countries is aggressiveness, reliance on military methods, creation of new seats of military danger, and the provocation of internecine war, crises and conflicts. This is evident in the increased US aggressiveness in every region of the world and in the whipping up of conflicts in the Middle East, Western, Southern and Southeast Asia, the Far East and Southern Africa, in the South Atlantic, Central America and the Caribbean.

The objective development of the present-day international situation in the non-aligned zone underscores that the fight against imperialism and neocolonialism and for stronger political and economic independence is inseparably linked with the struggle for peace and security. Experience has repeatedly demonstrated to the non-aligned countries that their national and social progress greatly depends on the international situation. Imperialism's stepped-up aggression and neocolonial intrigues make it even more imperative to unite the efforts of all peace-loving, anti-imperialist forces.

An important stage in the non-aligned countries' anti-imperialist struggle was the eighth summit conference, which took place in Harare in March 1986 in a complicated international situation and was preceded by hopes voiced in the Western press that it would moderate the movement's anti-imperialist trend. Were there any grounds for such views?

Western ideologists and politicians were expecting a lot. First, they believed that the West's political, economic and military pressure would intimidate the non-aligned countries; second, Western leaders planned to use new tactics in relation to the movement; third, they were banking on imposing on the conference, partly from without but mainly from within, problems which would lead the discussions in a direction that suited the West.

The imperialist policy of diktat and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of non-aligned countries was stepped up substantially on the eve of the conference, its new ele-

ment being the US State Department's attempt to interfere in the forums of the movement. American diplomacy first started this practice during the January 1983 Managua meeting of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers Coordinating Bureau and continued it during the Delhi summit.

Western pressure on the movement was accompanied by a major press propaganda campaign in the US and other NATO countries, with calls for the movement to "drop the radical rhetoric", "moderate its anti-West positions", and pursue "genuine non-alignment", the aim being to portray the West as all but a "true champion" or even a "defender" of "genuine non-alignment". Messages from US President Reagan, British Prime Minister Thatcher, and FRG Chancellor Kohl to the Chairman of the movement on the eve of the summit expressed similar sentiments.

Harare as Delhi saw the collapse of the plans of imperialism and international reaction to use the so-called Afghan question to split the movement. The peace initiatives of the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the resulting indirect negotiations between Afghanistan and Pakistan through a representative of the UN Secretary General convinced the heads of state or government of non-aligned countries of the sincere intentions of the Afghan leadership, whose persistent efforts to resolve the external aspect of the Afghan problem were supported by the majority of non-aligned countries. This matter certainly remains a very complicated one and will only be solved by very great effort. The political declarations adopted in Delhi and Harare expressed full support for the talks through the representatives of the UN Secretary General, describing them as a step in the right direction. It urged their continuation with a view to promoting an early political settlement and called on all states to take steps to create conditions conducive to normalisation of the situation in the region.

The Delhi and Harare Conferences regretted the continuation of the protracted Iran-Iraq conflict, which has very negatively affected the development of the countries involved and the entire non-aligned movement. It was that conflict which had prevented the convening of the regular non-aligned summit in Baghdad in September 1982.

Thus, the West's attempts to use the movement's sore points in the broad context of its political and military con-

frontation with world socialism and thereby to weaken the anti-imperialist tendency in the positions of non-aligned countries did not have the desired results. That is more, the conference decisions on a peaceful settlement of the existing problems ran counter to imperialism's policy and concepts of "controlling" conflicts by the force-reliant military means of interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

The forces of international imperialism and reaction were unable to change the main direction of the non-aligned movement. The Harare conference not only reiterated its adherence to that direction but also made more specific and coordinated the movement's principal strategic tasks for the near and more distant future. The conference "committed the Movement to work for the halting and reversal of present dangerous trends in the international situation and the promotion of conditions conducive to cooperation and peaceful coexistence among States." It reiterated that non-alignment involves "the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, hegemonism, foreign aggression, occupation and domination, as well as against apartheid, racism, Zionism, and all forms of dependence, intervention, interference and pressure as well as against great Power and bloc politics."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/41/697*, 14 October 1986, pp. 14-15.

### **The Non-Aligned Movement—an Important Factor in the Struggle for International Security and Curbing the Arms Race**

The non-aligned movement is a significant factor for peace, and that is especially important today. The key task in the struggle for peace is to avert a nuclear war, and curb and reverse the arms race. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries have been working tirelessly to achieve that, and the anti-nuclear and peace movements are broadening on all continents.

On the whole, the non-aligned movement is not bending under the pressure of the aggressive forces and pursues an anti-militarist and anti-imperialist policy. Its role as a factor for peace continues to increase. The political experience of the struggle against war, for international security and arms reductions is a criterion for this assessment.

The focus of world politics toward the end of the 1970s and the early 1980s was the struggle between the two completely opposed approaches to the present-day state of and prospects for international relations.

The first approach, that of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, positively assesses the military strategic parity achieved by the 1970s between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. Despite the various turns in the development of the international situation, the Soviet state has worked consistently to eliminate the nuclear danger.

But there is another approach, one of adventurism and readiness to risk humanity's vital interests for selfish objectives. The USA and some of its allies are trying to upset the military strategic parity, roll back the gains of detente, and dictate to other countries and peoples, not hesitating to use weapons and terrorism, which has been elevated to government policy. The USA has started technological re-equipment of its strategic forces and is deploying medium-range

missiles in Western Europe, to which are to be added anti-satellite and anti-missile space-based strike systems so as to be able to carry out nuclear aggression with impunity. In addition, nuclear-first-strike doctrines and concepts are being worked out in the hope of winning a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war.

What is the non-aligned movement's attitude to these two policies on war and peace and their concrete manifestations in international affairs?

In the main, there is no room for doubt about the choice made by the movement. The seventh non-aligned summit emphasised: "It is increasingly clear that in the present-day world there is no alternative to a policy of peaceful co-existence, detente and cooperation among States, irrespective of their economic and social systems, size and geographical location."<sup>1</sup>

This conclusion shows that there is an objective community of vital interests between the socialist and most newly-independent countries, which respectively need peace to build socialism and communism, and overcome the age-old backwardness left by colonialism.

The 1970s showed that it is easier for these states to strengthen their sovereignty and independence, defend their rights against imperialism, and achieve equal international cooperation under detente. In general, the imperialist method of resolving international problems "from a position of strength" and on the basis of military confrontation, one that is rejected by the socialist community in principle, directly endangers the existence of the small and developing countries and offers the least prospects to them. By aggravating the world situation and militarising international relations, imperialism undermines the security of the developing countries and international security as a whole, and makes it more difficult to restructure world economic ties on a just democratic basis. The vast majority of non-aligned states have pointed to the need for renewed detente, which Washington often tries to portray as advantageous only for the socialist states and all but a cover for "communist aggression" in the developing world. "After having lived through a promising state of detente in recent years," stated Ecuado-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 11.

rian President Hurtado Larrea in September 1983, "we now find ourselves in the midst of a political and military confrontation whose implications might prove to be more serious than those of the cold war. People everywhere are duty bound to defend peace, whether they come from the East, the West or the third world."<sup>1</sup>

Of great importance in this connection is the recognition by many non-aligned countries of the fact that nuclear weapons imperil all states and peoples without exception. Robert Mugabe, present coordinator and chairman of the movement, said at the Harare conference: "Preventing the annihilation of mankind consequent upon nuclear war is the precondition of all our endeavours."<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the non-aligned leaders have been greatly influenced by the conclusions of the scientists and military and civilian experts who in recent years have been warning about the disastrous consequences of a nuclear war. "The destructive power contained in nuclear stockpiles," said Indira Gandhi at the Delhi summit, "can kill human life, indeed all life, many times over and might well prevent its reappearance for ages to come. Terrifying is the vividness of such descriptions by scientists."<sup>3</sup>

Another powerful factor making the struggle against the war danger and the arms race a priority for non-aligned countries is the understanding that the very process of preparing the material base for war—the arms buildup—drains the world economy.

The Delhi Political Declaration states that the increase in military spending over the past few years has speeded up inflation, hiked the budget deficits and further reduced the already decreasing economic aid to the developing countries.

A nuclear aircraft carrier, it was noted at the conference, costs \$4 billion, which is more than the GNP of 53 countries. According to UN experts, in 1981 alone the world spent more per minute for military purposes than the sum required to feed over 2,000 children for one year in the developing countries. An additional allocation of \$200 million—the price of two strategic bombers—to the annual

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *UN Document A/38/PV.12*, 1 October 1983, pp. 13-15.

<sup>2</sup> *UN Document A/41/697*, 14 October 1986, p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, Appendix II, p. 146.

budget of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) would enable it to free the world of illiteracy in less than a decade and an allocation of \$500 million—equivalent to the cost of a single aircraft carrier—to the World Health Organisation (WHO) would be more than adequate to eradicate diseases such as malaria, trachoma, leprosy and yaws from the developing countries.

“The accumulation of modern weapons, particularly the existence and stockpiling of nuclear arms, not only presents an ever increasing danger to the very survival of mankind in times of war but also tends to undermine the general environment of security and dislocates the socio-economic priorities in times of peace,”<sup>1</sup> stated Nepalese Foreign Minister Khatri at the 38th UN General Assembly session.

The non-aligned countries’ active participation in the efforts to remove the war danger and their opposition to a militarist policy in world affairs is facilitated by the fact that imperialism’s reliance on force and its arbitrary inclusion of many developing countries in its sphere of “vital interests” forces those countries to spend on arms funds that are badly needed for development. More and more states are being drawn into the vicious circle of the arms race.

The developing countries account for about three-quarters of the total international arms trade, whose annual turnover was approximately \$26 billion in 1980. The US and its NATO allies are the largest arms exporters. Most experts agree that this trade means useless, unproductive and unfair exchange for the developing countries. Arms imports rob the importer countries of funds that could be used for the production of material benefits. According to some estimates, each dollar spent on arms in the developing countries cuts domestic investment by 25 cents. Arms imports increase the developing countries’ balance of payments deficit, making up almost 50% of their total deficit on current operations in 1978. Fidel Castro cited these figures at the seventh non-aligned summit and stated: “The international climate of tension and violence generated by the aggressive policies of the imperialist powers and their regional gendarmes, the aggressions and direct or indirect pressures aimed at destabilising or destroying revolutionary processes

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/PV.24*, 11 October 1983, p. 80.



and defending neo-colonial interests, the regional conflicts often encouraged by those very interests: these are the major factors that have contributed to Third World involvement in the arms race."<sup>1</sup>

Most non-aligned countries share the Soviet Union's conviction that it is necessary for states to pool efforts to take concrete measures to lessen and eventually to eliminate the possibility of nuclear war, to end the arms race and move over to disarmament, and thereby to establish reliable guarantees of peace. The leading countries of the group have made constructive proposals in this regard which are backed by the USSR and the other socialist community states.

That the socialist and non-aligned countries take a similar approach to peace, arms limitation and disarmament was seen in the socialist states' active support for the non-aligned initiative on holding the first and second special UN General Assembly sessions on disarmament in 1978 and 1982. These forums were major international events, considered the problem thoroughly and concretely, and made it a priority item on the international political agenda.

"The attainment of the objective of security, which is an inseparable element of peace," says the Final Document of the First UN General Assembly session on disarmament, "has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity. States have for a long time sought to maintain their security through the possession of arms. Admittedly, their survival has, in certain cases, effectively depended on whether they could count on appropriate means of defence. Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament, that is to say, through a gradual but effective process beginning with a reduction in the present level of armaments."<sup>2</sup>

In line with these goals, the first special session drew up a

<sup>1</sup> Fidel Castro, *The World Economic and Social Crisis. Its Impact on the Underdeveloped Countries, its Somber Prospects and the Need to Struggle if We Are to Survive. Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries*, Publishing Office of the Council of State, Havana, 1983, p. 204.

<sup>2</sup> *Yearbook of the United Nations 1978*, Volume 32, Department of Public Information, United Nations, New York, 1981, p. 39.

programme of action listing the paramount tasks and measures to achieve disarmament which states should tackle immediately so as to avert nuclear war, reverse the arms race and give the necessary impetus to the efforts to secure universal and complete disarmament under effective international control. The programme attaches primary importance to preventing a nuclear conflict and to nuclear disarmament, to prohibition or prevention of the development, production and use of other types of mass destruction weapons, to conventional arms and armed forces reduction, and to concomitant measures on both nuclear and conventional arms so as to create favourable conditions for curbing and ending the arms race.

Although the West obstructed the adoption of a comprehensive document, the UN special session showed that most member states, above all the socialist and non-aligned countries, want to see a breakthrough in this very important area. At the same time, during the discussion some non-aligned countries drew attention to the very significant fact that while the General Assembly was holding its first and second special disarmament sessions the NATO Council was holding a summit to adopt new arms race programmes.

It should be noted that the non-aligned countries' belief in security through disarmament is of particular importance today when the US is openly trying to impose its concept of "peace through force" as an alternative to states' efforts to limit and reduce the arms arsenals and eliminate the use of force from inter-state relations. This makes especially relevant the statement of the seventh conference that "international peace and security can only be ensured through general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, under effective international control". Non-aligned leaders have called for implementation of the provisions of the Final Document of the First Special Assembly session on disarmament.

The anti-imperialist content of this approach has been repeatedly explained by non-aligned countries. For example, Syria's UN representative Al-Atassi has stated: "...there is a close relationship between disarmament and true peace. Peace cannot come about without complete disarmament, and the arms race threatens international peace and security. That is why we believe that peace through disarmament

should be an integral part of the fight against colonialism and for the elimination of colonialism, apartheid, Zionism and racism in all its forms. These are causes of serious tension throughout the world and pose a threat to peace.”<sup>1</sup>

The Delhi Address of the seventh non-aligned summit also made international security through nuclear disarmament a priority, demanding a halt to the slide toward a nuclear catastrophe and calling on the nuclear states to take urgent and practical measures to prevent nuclear war.

Like the socialist countries, most non-aligned states advocate political, moral and psychological, and international legal barriers to the growing nuclear danger. Nigeria’s representative at the 38th UN General Assembly session stated that “dangerous doctrines of limited winnable or survivable nuclear war, or of flexible response, not only have lowered the nuclear threshold but have made the outbreak of nuclear war a threatening reality.”<sup>2</sup>

The backing of most non-aligned countries secured the adoption of a Draft Declaration on Condemnation of Nuclear War introduced by the Soviet Union at the 38th UN General Assembly session. The Declaration condemns nuclear war vehemently, unconditionally and forever as contrary to human conscience and reason, as the most monstrous crime against the peoples, and as a violation of the primary human right—the right to life. It also condemns the formulation, propounding, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts intended to provide “legitimacy” for the first use of nuclear weapons and in general to justify the “admissibility” of unleashing nuclear war.<sup>3</sup> These solemn and pithy formulations expressed the moral and political stance of socialist and many non-aligned countries on the most important question of today.

The non-aligned countries do not confine themselves to principled support for the Soviet Union’s efforts to create a moral and psychological climate in international relations which will make things hard for the warmongers; they also advocate concrete steps and hailed the USSR’s undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Non-aligned and socialist votes at recent General Assembly sessions have

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/C.I/38PV.15*, 4 November 1983, pp. 33-35.

<sup>2</sup> *UN Document A/C.I/38/PV.7*, 24 October 1983, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *UN General Assembly Resolution 38/75*, 13 January 1984, p. 1.

passed special resolutions demanding that all nuclear powers follow the Soviet example.

At the 38th General Assembly, non-aligned countries proposed that a no-first-use undertaking by nuclear powers should be enshrined in international documents, an idea supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which had earlier declared their readiness to implement the non-aligned-proposed international convention banning the use of nuclear weapons that would involve all nuclear states. Both initiatives have essentially the same orientation. "A ban on the use of nuclear weapons," stated Algeria's UN representative Sahnoun, "or at least of the first use of such weapons is, in this context, a first measure to relax tension and stave off the threat of nuclear war."<sup>1</sup> The Soviet Union has always pointed out that it would be a very important step toward complete banning of nuclear weapons if nuclear powers renounce their first use, for if there is no first strike then neither will there be a second or a third, and nuclear weapons will therefore not be used at all. This idea was jointly formulated in the historic Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and non-violent world signed in November 1986 by the leaders of non-aligned India and the Soviet Union. Both countries advanced a collective proposal: "Until nuclear weapons are liquidated, the Soviet Union and India proposed that an international convention be immediately concluded banning the use of or threat to use nuclear weapons."<sup>2</sup>

The non-aligned countries are specially worried by the prospect of a new and extremely dangerous spiral of the arms race, the nuclear arms race above all, which the United States and its NATO allies are beginning. The Political Declaration of the seventh non-aligned summit expressed profound concern over the fact that some nuclear states have already deployed or intend to deploy nuclear weapons in various regions of the world. Adopted in spring 1983, this Declaration was obviously referring primarily to the start of the deployment of US medium-range missiles in Western Europe that was scheduled for the end of the year.

At the General Assembly session held in spring of that

<sup>1</sup> UN Document A/C.I/38/PV.9, 24 October 1983, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, 28 November 1986.

year some non-aligned countries drew attention to the fact that the medium range missiles which the US was at that time preparing to deploy and is presently deploying in Western Europe can be targeted at socialist states as well as scores of Near and Middle East and African countries. India and other Asian states are justifiably worried about their security in the face of the US plans to equip its military bases on Diego Garcia island and in other regions of Asia and the Pacific with nuclear weapons.

A central demand of non-aligned countries, one made repeatedly at UN General Assembly sessions, is for a halt to the building-up of nuclear weapons, including deployment of nuclear weapons, a nuclear freeze, and immediate and substantial cuts in the nuclear arsenals.

In 1983, non-aligned and socialist community voting passed a Soviet-initiated proposal on a quantitative and qualitative nuclear freeze by all nuclear powers or initially by the USSR and the USA alone as an example for the other nuclear states.

Simultaneously, the non-aligned countries initiated two resolutions, later passed, calling for a freeze. It is important to note that these documents were a kind of official non-aligned response to the arguments of the US and its allies against a freeze. They refuted Washington's contention that it could not agree to a freeze because it had to "catch up" with the USSR in several types of nuclear arms. The non-aligned countries stated that "conditions are most propitious for such a freeze, since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America are now equitable in nuclear military power and it seems evident that there exists between them an overall rough parity."<sup>1</sup>

As a counter to the American argument that a further US nuclear build-up could all but enhance the stability of the military strategic situation, the non-aligned movement firmly declared that the existing nuclear arsenals are already enough to annihilate all life on Earth.

The non-aligned countries also rebuffed the NATO claim that a freeze is unacceptable because it is unverifiable. The resolution already quoted also noted that "the mere applica-

<sup>1</sup> *Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its thirty-eighth session*, 20 September-20 December 1983 and 26 June 1984, United Nations, New York, 1984, p. 66.

tion of the system of surveillance, verification and control already agreed upon in some previous cases would be sufficient to provide a reasonable guarantee of faithful compliance with the undertakings derived from the freeze.”<sup>1</sup>

An equally convincing rebuff was given to the argument that an end to the nuclear arms race could impede the talks on nuclear arms reductions. The General Assembly stated that a nuclear arms freeze would constitute “the most effective first step for the achievement of the above-mentioned two objectives since it would provide a favourable environment for the conduct of the reduction negotiations while, at the same time, preventing the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry during the period when the negotiations would take place.”<sup>2</sup>

In summer 1984 the heads of state or government of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden expressed their support for a freeze in a joint appeal to all nuclear powers.

The public at large, not only in those six states but also in many non-aligned countries, drew attention to the fact that, unlike the Western nuclear powers, the Soviet Union had responded positively to the very first proposal. A USSR government statement of 2 June 1984 said in connection with the six-state appeal that the USSR had advanced a concrete programme of measures toward a nuclear arms freeze that included a whole package of effective and complementary steps. The statement went on to say that the fact that the joint declaration of states representing different regions had the same thrust showed that the urgent need for such measures was felt by all. At the same time, the Soviet Union re-emphasised that it was important to prevent a spread of nuclear weapons to regions where they do not presently exist and to begin to remove them from those regions where they are now deployed. The USSR also reiterated its position of principle favouring more and larger nuclear-free zones, a matter which is a focus of attention of many non-aligned countries.

A traditional sphere of joint or parallel action by socialist and non-aligned countries is the campaign to end and ban

<sup>1</sup> *Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its thirty-eighth session*, 20 September-20 December 1983 and 26 June 1984, United Nations, New York, 1984, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

nuclear weapon tests by all nuclear powers in all places, including underground. In 1983, Ghana's UN representative described readiness to implement a test ban, which the US has cynically shown that it lacks, as "a litmus test of the sincerity of nuclear Powers when it comes to arms control."<sup>1</sup>

In keeping with the non-aligned movement's desire to ensure that nuclear weapons will not be used against them, the Soviet Union advocated a stronger nuclear non-proliferation regime and firm security guarantees for non-nuclear countries.

At the first UN General Assembly special session on disarmament in 1978 the USSR stated that it would never use nuclear weapons against those states which have renounced the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territory. At the 33rd General Assembly in that same year, the Soviet Union introduced a draft international convention under which the nuclear states would undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states party to the convention which have renounced the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory or anywhere under their jurisdiction or control.

In order to strengthen security guarantees for non-nuclear countries, the USSR also proposed that all nuclear states should, as a first step toward concluding such a convention, make similar statements on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states which do not have such weapons on their territory. The USSR is also prepared to conclude bilateral agreements with all such non-nuclear states.

Unlike the USSR, the USA is obviously reluctant to be bound by precise undertakings not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. It has stated that it will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states that have signed the treaty on non-proliferation or have otherwise pledged not to acquire nuclear weapons, except those instances in which the USA or its allies are attacked by a non-nuclear state which is an ally of a nuclear state or which carries out such an attack jointly or with the backing of a nuclear state.

This American wording in fact gives the USA the right to

<sup>1</sup> UN Document A/C.I/38/PV.5, 20 October 1983, p. 61.

determine when it is permissible to use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state.

Non-aligned documents have repeatedly made note of the importance of using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes. Soviet proposals, including those made at the UN, map out the way to ensure this, and at recent Assembly sessions many non-aligned countries have agreed with the USSR's view that an arms race in space would greatly increase the risk of a nuclear catastrophe, would undermine the prospects for arms limitation and reduction in general, and would force states to spend colossal sums on the arms race. Non-aligned countries demanded that such a development should be averted before it is too late.

The Soviet initiatives aimed at preventing this, reliably blocking all channels, bar none, to militarisation of space, and ensuring that it is used exclusively for humanity's benefit have been broadly supported. The 1984 vote in the UN on a resolution on preventing an arms race in outer space was highly significant: 150 states, including virtually all the non-aligned ones, the USSR and the othersocialistcommunity countries, voted for, with the USA alone abstaining.

Non-aligned states firmly supported the USSR's UN initiative on preventing militarisation of outer space and voted for the resolution. They noted in particular that the Soviet approach would prohibit and eliminate a whole class of arms—strike space weapons, including anti-satellite and anti-missile space-based systems, and also all land-, air- or sea-based weapons designed to hit targets in space—while providing for reliable monitoring of the parties' commitments.

Further evidence of the similarity between the positions of the socialist community and the non-aligned movement on these burning questions is provided by the Soviet-Indian 1986 Delhi Declaration, which made such important proposals as complete destruction of the nuclear arsenals by the end of the century, a ban on any weapons in outer space, complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, ban on the development of new types of mass destruction weapons, a chemical weapons ban and destruction of existing stocks, and reduction of the levels of conventional weapons and armed forces.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 28 November 1986.



At the UN and other international forums many non-aligned countries have been resolutely rebuffing the US slander campaign claiming that Soviet-made chemical weapons are allegedly used in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. The attempt by the American representative to table a resolution on the matter at the 38th General Assembly session ended in failure. Seeing that the draft had no chance of obtaining a majority support, especially from the non-aligned countries, the US delegation chose to withdraw it.

At the same time, non-aligned states such as Vietnam, Laos, and Afghanistan drew on a great number of irrefutable facts to show the whole world the American militarists' criminal attitude to chemical weapons which broadly used them against the peoples of Indo-China and is now supplying these weapons to bandits infiltrated into Afghanistan to wage an undeclared war against that country.

Although the greatest threat to humanity is posed by nuclear and other mass destruction weapons, an increasing danger stems from so-called conventional arms, which have long ceased to be such in both purpose and specifications. On the whole, the present level of science and technology makes it possible to develop arms which, even in a non-nuclear war, could annihilate all living things over a vast area in a short space of time.

US aggression against the peoples of Indo-China, Israel's against the Arabs, South Africa's against Angola and Mozambique, the undeclared war against Afghanistan and Nicaragua, and the US occupation of Grenada are a nowhere near complete list of examples of how imperialism and its placemen in different regions use conventional arms against the states and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Soviet Union has been urgently raising the question of ending the conventional arms race and reducing those weapons both globally and regionally, particularly in those regions where huge stockpiles have been accumulated or where the situation endangers international peace and security. The USSR also wants to limit international trade in conventional arms and conventional arms deliveries, with due account, of course, of the legitimate rights of the states resisting aggression and the peoples fighting against colonial and racist oppression. Although the non-aligned countries have in a general way voiced support for a curbing of the

conventional arms race, on the whole they are far from active enough in this important area of the anti-war struggle.

The USA is particularly open in its pretensions to superiority over all countries in the development of a navy, which is intended for aggression and diktat in relation to non-aligned states. In the past few years Washington has relied heavily on "gunboat diplomacy" in the worst traditions of colonial plunder. Suffice it to recall the landing of American marines in Grenada and Lebanon, the mining of Nicaraguan ports and the continual American naval manoeuvres in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans in direct proximity to scores of independent states.

The non-aligned movement therefore responded positively to the USSR's proposal on curbing the arms race on the seas and oceans, a move which could do much to avert war. Along with other socialist countries, the Soviet Union proposed a series of specific measures to effect mutual limitations of naval activity and naval arms limitation and reduction, and also appropriate confidence-building measures—both generally and in individual regions like the Indian, Atlantic or Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean, or the Persian Gulf. The USSR believed it important and urgent to agree not to expand naval activity in regions of conflicts or tension.

Despite US and its allies' opposition, the 38th General Assembly session approved for the first time a socialist-initiated resolution on naval arms limitation and reduction and the application of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. Many non-aligned countries, including Algeria, Argentina, the Congo, Ethiopia, Libya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe, voted for the resolution.

A decidedly anti-imperialist demand of non-aligned countries is that the Indian Ocean should be transformed into a zone of peace, its central aspect being the proposal to liquidate all military bases in that region. The Soviet Union supports this demand and advocates early convening of an international conference to that end. The idea is all the more urgent because the United States continues to build up its naval presence in the Indian Ocean and of late has been making increasingly overt threats to intervene in the Persian Gulf. Of positive significance also is the non-aligned proposal to create a zone of peace and cooperation in the

Mediterranean. The proposal by Cuba and Nicaragua to establish a zone of peace in the Caribbean is aimed against the American policy of interfering in the region's affairs. The socialist community countries have repeatedly declared their readiness actively to participate in creating zones of peace and nuclear-free zones in the various regions where such zones are advocated by the states located there.

The Soviet Union backs the demand of many states, primarily developing ones, for arms limitation and reduction measures to be taken in close connection with a solution to the problem of economic development. It understands that only real steps toward disarmament can make it possible to switch resources to resolving the truly burning social and economic problems in the developing countries, which the colonialists mercilessly plundered in the past and which the international monopolies would like to exploit indefinitely.

Non-aligned countries are increasingly aware of this fact. "The struggle for disarmament," said Mozambique Foreign Minister dos Santos at the UN, "is a struggle for peace and development. Without disarmament there will be no peace and without peace there will be no development."<sup>1</sup> And at the 38th General Assembly session the head of the Rwandan delegation stated: "It is now time for specific steps to be taken in order to frame a peace strategy and reverse the present trend towards an escalation of the arms race in which immense financial, material and scientific resources are squandered, and which at the same time involves a grave risk that the entire human race may be exterminated."<sup>2</sup>

The USSR has been working persistently for real measures to curb the arms race and effect disarmament which would release funds for development, making many concrete proposals inside and outside the UN in this regard. In 1962 the USSR submitted to the 17th General Assembly session a "Draft Declaration on the Channelling to Peaceful Purposes of the Means and Resources Released as a Result of Disarmament". It also introduced a proposal envisaging that the funds obtained by ending nuclear weapon production and reducing the nuclear arsenals should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, including development. These

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/PV.30*, 15 October 1983, p. 106.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

proposals were hailed by many non-aligned countries.

One of the most effective yet simple ways to curb the arms race and thereby obtain additional funds for development are military budget cuts. Soviet initiatives on this score drew wide approval in the UN, above all among non-aligned members.

It is over ten years since the General Assembly approved the Soviet proposal for a 10% cut in the military budgets of the permanent Security Council members and use of a part of the funds saved for aid to the developing countries. Discussed at Assembly plenary sessions, this initiative was supported by Algeria, Ghana, Indonesia, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Syria, and most other non-aligned countries.

Since then the Soviet Union has pressed for implementation of this Assembly resolution, relying on the broad support of socialist and non-aligned states, but this has been frustrated by US and NATO reluctance to reduce their military appropriations, whose growth by leaps and bounds has been planned until the end of the century.

It is only natural that the 1986 Soviet-Indian Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and non-violent world contains a special principle which, like its other principles, is addressed to the peoples and leaders of all countries. This is the sixth principle: "The resources spent on arms should be used for social and economic development."<sup>1</sup>

Virtually all non-aligned states are now for military budget cuts, but they do not always consistently advocate specific measures to achieve this. For example, they are open to the Western proposal to assess states' "military efforts and potential" and to gather more data on the military use of human and material resources, under the pretext of bringing military spending "out into the open". It is easy to see that such ideas are aimed at concealing the real reason for the arms race, namely, the fact that the USA and other Western states do not have the political will to carry out disarmament and thereby to release funds for development.

That is also the aim of the proposals that seek to replace military budget cuts with deliberately complicated research into comparisons of military budgets, i.e. with endless arguments about figures between economists, statisticians and

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 28 November 1986.

other experts. Such an approach is alien to the Soviet Union for that would be yet another case of holding talks for the sake of talks, or, to be more precise, of creating semblance of efforts towards disarmament while the arms race continues apace.

The ideas to tax military spending are unrealistic but enjoy support among some non-aligned countries. The aim is not to end the arms race but merely to collect a "pay off" for continuing it. Moreover, these ideas could create a paradoxical situation in which a desire for higher weapons-related deductions from other states would give some countries a vested interest in a further arms build-up.

Another object of sharp political struggle is the Western proposal, supported by some non-aligned countries, to hold an international conference on various aspects of the interconnection between disarmament and development which would not in fact be linked with disarmament measures at all. The hope is that such a forum could be used to conceal their unwillingness not to take feasible arms limitation measures.

As regards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, they stress that such measures can be taken. A good basis for agreement is the socialist states' specific proposals over the last few years to make a percentage or an absolute cut in their military budgets, and their readiness to decide the question of the initial size of such cuts on a mutually acceptable basis and to reach agreement, as a first step, on a budget freeze. A number of non-aligned states, among them Angola, Mozambique and Afghanistan, have made this point on more than one occasion at the UN.

In an effort to get things moving on this extremely important problem, the Warsaw Treaty states have proposed to the NATO states that both blocs refrain from increasing and later cut their military spending, emphasising that military budget cuts, first and foremost by all nuclear states and the other militarily strong states, would effectively promote an end to the arms race and a move to disarmament, with the released funds being used for socio-economic development, including that of the developing countries.

A joint document handed to NATO on 5 March 1984 by the socialist community countries proposes a start to talks on this problem; however, NATO has yet to respond to it.

The Soviet Union is convinced that if the USA and its allies, with their great economic and military potential, were also willing to agree practically to military budget cuts an agreement stopping the endless spiral of military spending would have become a factor of political life, enabling large financial and material resources to be spent on social and economic development.

An analysis of the non-aligned stance on international security and arms limitation shows that it is dually influenced by the present-day aggravation of the political struggle internationally. Concern over the dangerous development of the international situation, seen both in the threat of nuclear war and in imperialism's more aggressive policy in different regions, leads these countries to invigorate their anti-imperialist and anti-militarist actions, a tendency reflected in the series of non-aligned documents adopted in the early 1980s. Thus, the February 1981 Delhi Foreign Ministers conference stated that while differences of perception might exist among various non-aligned countries on specific aspects of the international situation, the movement, as a whole, is united on the need for the universal relaxation of tensions; the halting and reversing of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race; the achievement of general and complete disarmament; the continuation of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism, racism, including Zionism, apartheid, all forms of expansionism, foreign occupation, domination and hegemony; and support for the struggle of the national liberation movements.

Naturally, non-aligned unification on that basis is not to the liking of the imperialist circles, and they have been doing everything to split the movement and invigorate its right wing, which is composed of states that are economically and politically dependent on imperialism. Most of them have reactionary proimperialist regimes which are closely entwined with Western monopolies and militarists.

The USA and its closest allies have been trying of late to take advantage of some non-aligned countries' confusion in the face of the present heightening of international tension. The Washington administration has been purposely demonstrating its hard line in international affairs and its readiness to resort to pressure, blackmail and threats against non-aligned countries, especially those which support initiatives of

the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

Thus, for example, the American press has widely publicised the practice of the US UN mission of reporting to Congress in detail on the position of many UN members on specific questions of concern to Washington, including arms limitation. It is significant that the report presented on the 38th General Assembly session admitted that non-aligned countries voted with the USA on only 20% of all resolutions passed at the session (457 resolutions and decisions). Conversely, socialist and non-aligned voting coincided on almost 80% of all resolutions. This contrast was particularly striking on questions of preventing nuclear war and limiting nuclear arms.

Making no secret of its disgust, the American press dropped hints and made direct threats against non-aligned countries, writing openly that the American Congress would take non-aligned members' UN voting into account when allocating economic aid, and that other economic and political sanctions would be applied. International observers regarded as an attempt frontally to pressure the international organisations themselves the US decision to pull out of UNESCO as of December 1984 if that organisation did not fulfill a series of demands, including less attention to peace and disarmament.

It is obvious that Washington's flagrant economic blackmail and political pressure places a number of non-aligned members in a difficult situation, but it is also obvious that imperialism cannot silence the movement, whose voice is more and more clearly heard on vital questions of war and peace. And this is especially so in the UN. By supporting the proposals of the USSR and the other socialist community countries and advancing their own initiatives aimed at lessening the war danger and ensuring international peace, most non-aligned countries have been openly doing battle with imperialism's militarist course and favouring peace in international politics.

The progressive public in non-aligned countries points out that if the independent states yield to imperialist pressure it could cause them to surrender positions and actually encourage Western aggressiveness. This also fully applies to the inclination of some developing countries to accept the falsehood of Western propaganda about equal responsibility of

the USSR and the USA, of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO for the aggravated international situation, the arms race, and the outstanding problems of arms limitation and reduction. It is easy to see that this is a clumsy attempt to protect those who are really responsible for the present state of world affairs, on the one hand, and, on the other, to break the non-aligned countries away from their natural allies in the struggle to enhance international security and curb the arms race. The non-aligned countries are, as it were, being given a convenient excuse to "sit tight" in a worsening international situation.

Historical experience and the daily practice of political struggle is convincing non-aligned countries that success in defending their vital interests will come through greater unity and close cooperation with all countries favouring peace, first and foremost with the socialist countries. That is why the imperialist circles are doing everything possible to split the non-aligned movement. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries take a completely different approach. A concrete manifestation of this was Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to India, the largest non-aligned country, in late 1986 and the historical documents adopted there, among them the Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and non-violent world, which shows the common adherence of India and the USSR to a new political thinking. A good example of the joint efforts of the socialist community and the non-aligned movement to resolve the principal problem of our time was the adoption by the 41st UN General Assembly session of a resolution "On the creation of a comprehensive system of international peace and security", whose final text was proposed by socialist countries and non-aligned Libya.



### **The Non-Aligned Movement and Zones of Peace**

The non-aligned movement has been proposing the establishment of zones of peace since 1970. In this initiative, too, the movement is not alone: as early as 1959 the Soviet Union put forward the idea of creating zones of peace.

At different times the non-aligned movement has advocated peace zones or supported initiatives to that effect in four regions: the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, South-east Asia, and the South Pacific.

The movement's first proposal for a zone of peace was in the Indian Ocean. And this is quite understandable. The Indian Ocean region is a densely populated area rich in many valuable resources, and many vital transport routes are concentrated there. In addition, the Indian Ocean, which for a long time was an arena of struggle between capitalist states for colonial possessions, became the scene of stormy anti-colonial processes following the Second World War. Today, too, the region's non-aligned countries continue to fight for full political and economic independence. On the other hand, the USA and its imperialist allies have been building up their military presence, which was invigorated in the first half of the 1960s and reached an unheard-of scale toward the end of the 1970s and in the early 1980s. The USA wants to maintain or establish control over the sea lanes of the Indian Ocean and over the natural resources of the coastal and mainland states, and also to suppress the national liberation movements and the other progressive processes.

This has naturally been of concern to the states of this region. As far back as 1945, Nehru proposed a closer union of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean for unity against war and outside aggression. Later, while working to convene the first Asian Conference (Delhi, March 1947), he drew attention once again to the security problems of the Indian

Ocean. As the Western military presence escalated, there was an intensification of the struggle of the young Asian and African states against encroachments on their independence and sovereignty, a concrete manifestation of this being their work to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

If, in addition to the above, one takes into consideration that 40% of non-aligned member countries are presently situated in the Indian Ocean, it will be clear that the idea of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean is central among the specific non-aligned initiatives aimed to enhance international peace and security and remove the threat to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of member states. The idea was prompted mainly by the Indian Ocean states' desire to ensure their security and steady socio-economic development without outside interference, and to remove the material basis for such interference that has been created by the imperialist powers. Initially, the question raised was that of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Indian Ocean. This was done by the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) Sirimavo Bandaranaike at the second non-aligned summit, held in 1964 in Cairo.

The following main elements of the idea of a zone of peace were present at this stage.

First, ridding the region in which a zone of peace is to be created of nuclear weapons. Although it makes up the principal content of the concept of a "nuclear-free zone", this element was not further developed and concretised in conference resolutions.

Second, it was understood even then that the participation of the nuclear powers is essential in the creation and existence of nuclear-free zones. The programme adopted at the Cairo conference reduced this participation to respect for the status of nuclear-free zones but did not specify how this should be fulfilled.

Third, the conference decisions assessed the possible realisation of the initiative to set up nuclear-free zones not only as a measure meeting the interests of a certain group of states but also as a contribution to international peace and security.

Fourth, the programme stated that the existence of imperialist military bases is inconsistent with the preservation of peace and security in a region. This proposition was later de-

veloped into one of the primary elements of the idea of a zone of peace.

Although the decisions taken at this stage were still fairly general, the bases of the zone-of-peace idea can be considered to have been laid in the mid-1960s.

Actions by the non-aligned movement prior to referring the matter to the UN were an important stage in the formation of the idea of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean and its discussion at various international forums.

At the third summit (Lusaka, 1970), Sri Lanka reraised the question of the Indian Ocean, calling on this occasion for a zone of peace. The Conference adopted a "Resolution on the United Nations" which requested a group of non-aligned countries to raise at the upcoming General Assembly session the question of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and the "adoption of a Declaration calling upon all States to consider and respect the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace from which Great Power rivalries and competition as well as bases conceived in the context of such rivalries and competition, either army, navy or air force bases, are excluded. The area should also be free of nuclear weapons."<sup>1</sup>

The Lusaka conference formulated the following principles for the creation of a zone of peace: exclusion of great power "rivalry or competition"; absence of military bases of non-coastal states; non-deployment of nuclear weapons by the great powers, and universal recognition of a zone of peace as such.

Along with confirming the earlier principles, the conference also, for the first time, advanced the thesis of "rivalry and competition" between great powers, which actually blamed the aggravation of the situation in the Indian Ocean not only on the imperialist powers but on the Soviet Union as well. This thesis was subsequently included in non-aligned programme documents and in UN decisions on this question.

However, the use of this thesis by some non-aligned countries plays into the hands of those quarters that do not want a zone of peace and is the cause of certain difficulties in co-operation between non-aligned and socialist countries in im-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 56.

plementing this proposal. Can one really speak of "rivalry and competition" even in the purely military sense when the overall tonnage of the Soviet battleships periodically deployed in the Indian Ocean is less than 50% of that of one American aircraft carrier, and when, in addition to the US air force formations, France has a substantial air force contingent permanently present in the Indian Ocean, and Britain and other NATO countries periodically? Even Western data show that almost half of the Soviet naval contingent in the region is composed of auxiliary ships not intended for use in military operations. Furthermore, any assessment of the correlation between Soviet and Western military forces in this region should take into consideration, first, the possibility (which the USSR does not have) of drastically and rapidly building up the naval presence in the region with ships from the Sixth and Seventh American fleets. Second, the numerous bases used by NATO armed forces, which the USSR also does not have, and third, the presence in the Indian Ocean of Australia and South Africa, which are fairly powerful military allies of the imperialist powers.

Of importance also is the qualitative composition of the fleets. NATO has deployed in the Indian Ocean naval forces designed to carry out all possible military operations, special emphasis being placed on giving these forces capacity to intervene. That is the whole purpose of sending to the region aircraft carriers and marines and other land combat forces. Thus, since 1980 the US air force alone has deployed there permanently a task force composed of one-two aircraft carriers and up to 25 other large warships, amphibious forces and up to 17 transports with enough materiel for a 30-day marine brigade operation.

By contrast, the USSR sends to the Indian Ocean the minimum forces needed to ensure its legitimate interests in the region and to prevent the imperialist states from unleashing aggression from the sea. Unlike the USA, the USSR navy has no forces for amphibious operations, which is further proof that the Soviet Navy has only defensive functions.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly pointed out to the non-aligned countries that use of the thesis on "the rivalry and competition between great powers" seeks to place equal blame on the USSR and the imperialist powers for heightened tension in the Indian Ocean, which is actually incorrect

and openly biased. It is unobjective and unjust to equate the political goals and means to achieve them used by the USSR, on the one hand, and the imperialist states, on the other.

First, the USSR did not begin the build-up of military, including naval, presence in the Indian Ocean, and has never established military bases there. Its naval presence is limited and is confined to temporary and periodical deployment of warships and auxiliary ships whose numbers and qualitative indicators are below those of the imperialist naval forces permanently stationed there.

Second, from the viewpoint of national security the Indian Ocean is of incomparably greater interest to the Soviet Union than the imperialist powers, but the USSR seeks to use peaceful rather than any other means to safeguard its own interests. In displaying restraint, the Soviet Union does not build up its naval forces in the region to the level maintained by the USA and its allies.

Third, during all the time that the USSR has had a naval presence in the Indian Ocean it has never endangered the security of the coastal states. Soviet warships are located in the area in strict accordance with the norms of international law. They call at ports only for fuel, water and food or for official friendly visits.

From the outset the non-aligned movement has felt that zones of peace would enhance international peace and security and the stability of all states and peoples. This was stated at the 1971 Foreign Ministers Consultative Meeting, which also decided to get the 26th General Assembly session to take concrete steps to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

On 16 December 1971 the UN Assembly passed resolution No. 2832 (XXVI) entitled "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace" in which it called on the great powers immediately to hold consultations with a view to halting a further build-up of their military presence in the Indian Ocean, liquidating all bases, military installations and means of supply, refraining from deploying nuclear and other mass destruction weapons, and eliminating all manifestations of a military presence.

Having got the peace zone question included on the UN agenda, the non-aligned movement continued to elaborate

it, taking account of the work of the UN. Each summit conference and Foreign Ministers meeting held since the second conference in Lusaka, which put forward this initiative, has taken decisions on both organisational questions and questions of substance connected with the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Among them are the decisions of the 1975 Lima session of the ministerial conference to initiate close cooperation and action so that a conference of countries of this region be held in order to secure the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Subsequent summit conferences and ministerial meetings also took decisions on convening the above conference.

An important stage toward a broad international forum on zones of peace was the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, whose primary purpose was to bring those countries' position closer and try to elaborate a united opinion on further measures to create zones of peace.

Held in July 1979 at the UN headquarters, the meeting was fairly representative: 18 states, including all permanent Security Council members, attended along with the 44 littoral and hinterland states. The meeting adopted a Final Document which contained a section entitled "Principles of Agreement for the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace" which, in spite of shortcomings and political inaccuracies, could serve as a programme for further action.

Also of importance were the organisational decisions taken by the meeting, which recommended to the General Assembly that it fix the date and the venue of the conference on the Indian Ocean and entrust the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, which it was suggested should be expanded for this purpose, to undertake the preparatory work for the conference, including consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. But the USA's obstructionist policy has more than once caused a postponement of the conference on the Indian Ocean. The 40th and 41st UN General Assembly sessions have resolved that it should be convened not later than 1988.

Because the peace zone proposal for the Indian Ocean is the most urgent of similar non-aligned initiatives for other regions and has been most thoroughly elaborated, it is important to consider the content of this initiative today, especially since the movement's present position on creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean can, as a whole, also be regarded as its maximum programme in respect of similar proposals for other regions.

The purpose of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is to protect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the states there and thereby create conditions of peace and security in which they can develop their cooperation to resolve political, economic and social problems. A zone of peace implies eliminating colonialism, racism and apartheid, and the threat to the states' right freely to dispose of their natural resources.

The significance of a zone of peace is not confined to the Ocean itself but rather should be regarded as a contribution to detente, peace and security. Measures to limit arms, above all mass destruction weapons, should be an integral element of the process of creating a zone of peace.

A principal condition for a zone of peace is an end to foreign military presence through agreements between the states that have a military presence, and between those states and interested countries of the Indian Ocean. An end to foreign military presence includes liquidation of military bases, means of service and other installations for land troops and naval and air forces on the islands and in the littoral and hinterland states, non-deployment of mass destruction weapons, primarily nuclear weapons, and an end to the ranging of the non-littoral states' armed forces against each other. These states should not only liquidate their bases but also undertake not to attempt to set up or acquire them in future. Furthermore, non-littoral states should not draw Indian Ocean countries into military groupings. In their turn, the latter should withdraw from military groupings in which non-littoral states, the great powers, first and foremost, participate or which were set up under their influence, should disband intra-regional military groupings directed against other states of the region, and should liquidate the military bases, means of service and other installations used by these groupings.

The international waters of the Indian Ocean remain open for free and unhindered use for peaceful purposes in accordance with international law.

The contractual basis for a zone of peace shall be an agreement concluded as a result of an international conference attended by the Indian Ocean states, the great powers that are UN Security Council permanent members, and the other states which make broad use of the Indian Ocean waters. A zone of peace shall be established on a voluntary basis in line with the UN Charter and international law. The zone of peace status shall cover the Indian Ocean within certain agreed limits.

From the very outset the non-aligned movement's Indian Ocean peace zone initiative has been vehemently opposed by the United States.

The USA and some of its allies have been drastically increasing the level of their military, above all naval, presence in the Indian Ocean, especially since 1978 when the USA unilaterally broke off the Soviet-American talks on limiting and then reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean. Using various pretexts, the USA and some of its allies, especially Britain and France, have at times concentrated up to 60 warships in the Indian Ocean. Grouped into carrier striking forces and operational marine units, these forces are obviously intended primarily for direct military intervention in the affairs of littoral states if the American military and political leadership considers their policy inimical to US "national" or "vital" interests.

The USA already has over 30 bases there, for example on Diego Garcia island, but is not satisfied with that: it is trying to acquire more and more bridgeheads for aggression. In recent times the USA has used pressure and bribery to obtain the possibility to use bases in Pakistan, Somali, Egypt and Kenya, and has been trying to wrest permission to deploy its armed forces in Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and the Comoro Islands.

The Central Command (CENTCOM) was established on 1 January 1983 as part of the American Joint Chiefs of Staff to coordinate militarist actions. Its sphere of action covers a vast section of the region's north-west, including the territory of 19 littoral and hinterland countries, the Persian Gulf, and a sizable part of the sea area of the Indian



Ocean. The Command directs the US rapid deployment forces, whose purpose is to carry out armed intervention in the affairs of young states.

On the diplomatic front, these actions were supplemented by attempts to divide the non-aligned countries, prevent them from elaborating a united position on a zone of peace, and impede constructive cooperation between non-aligned and socialist countries.

A primary target of Western subversion in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the question of the convocation of an international conference on the Indian Ocean. In 1979 the Committee decided that such a conference should be convened in 1981, but since then it has been postponed on five occasions. By delaying the conference time after time, the US and its allies hope to bury altogether the idea of a zone of peace.

Unlike the imperialist states, the USSR is for constructive cooperation between all states and forces interested in a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

The USSR's approach to this problem is part and parcel of the package of Soviet initiatives to lay the bases of the comprehensive international security system proposed at the 27th Party Congress. In making numerous peace initiatives, the USSR constantly underscores its readiness to study all proposals stemming from a sincere desire for lasting peace and security. The Soviet proposals are fully in harmony with the peace-promoting efforts of other countries and nations. The CPSU and the Soviet state always support initiatives aimed to calm and stabilise the situation in different regions, including initiatives on zones of peace. The new edition of the CPSU Programme expresses the conviction that "Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Pacific and the Indian Oceans can and must become zones of peace and good-neighbourliness."<sup>1</sup>

Naturally, in taking into consideration the need to enhance international peace and security, the USSR is guided by its own national interests, which are fully compatible with the idea of a zone of peace. These interests may be divided into four groups.

<sup>1</sup> *The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A New Edition*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1986, p. 75.

First, a zone of peace in an ocean close to the southern borders of the USSR will help to eliminate the existing threat to Soviet security posed by the armed forces of the USA and some of its allies deployed in the south. A zone of peace in the Indian Ocean which envisages limiting and reducing the military presence of non-littoral states and non-deployment of nuclear weapons would substantially enhance Soviet security in the south.

Second, like the other users of the ocean, whether littoral or non-littoral, the USSR is interested in the security of the sea lanes running through the Indian Ocean. However, the USSR's special geographical location means that it uses the Indian Ocean year round as an open seaway linking the country's European part with the Soviet Far East and having great defence and economic importance.

Third, the Indian Ocean is of interest to the USSR from the viewpoint of scientific activity connected with its space programmes. In addition, as stated in a letter from the USSR's permanent UN representative to the Secretary-General, the Soviet Union has been conducting research in the region to ensure the safe navigation of its vessels.

Fourth, the forementioned letter further stated that the Soviet Union has always rendered substantial aid to the Indian Ocean countries in their struggle for national liberation and in their struggle for economic independence and against the reactionary and aggressive forces of imperialism. The USSR maintains friendly relations with these countries, relations which in some cases are based on treaties of friendship and cooperation. Concluded in strict accordance with the principles and purposes of the UN Charter, above all respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, these treaties aim to develop and strengthen all-round relations of friendship and cooperation and enhance international peace and security.

Such are the circumstances influencing the USSR's attitude to a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Its position was set out in detail in the section of a Soviet Memorandum on arms race and disarmament submitted to the UN on 28 September 1976 entitled "Zones of peace in the Indian Ocean and other regions".

In the view of the USSR, the key question is that there should be no foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean,

that the bases set up there should be liquidated and that no new ones should be established. With respect to the Soviet Union, it has never had any plans to build military bases in the Indian Ocean.

If the question of foreign military bases is resolved in this way, the USSR would be prepared to seek, along with other interested powers, ways to reduce on a mutual basis the military activity of non-littoral states in the Indian Ocean and in regions in direct proximity to it.

Certainly, a zone of peace must fully take account of the universally accepted norms of international law with respect to freedom of navigation on the high sea and the consequent need for port calls and research.

Regarding the specific method of resolving this question, the USSR, taking the foregoing into consideration, expressed in its Memorandum willingness to consider the Indian Ocean states' proposal to convene an international conference to discuss the practical measures for turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, and later took an active part in the preparation for such conference.

The USSR's approach to the zone of peace accords with the opinion of the non-aligned countries which initiated the idea that its principal purpose is to remove the threat to the security of the Indian Ocean countries emanating from the sea. The USSR has repeatedly said that it is prepared to reach agreement on limiting the military presence of hinterland states in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere. In an effort to facilitate progress on a zone of peace, the Soviet Union held talks with the USA in 1977 and 1978 on limiting and later reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean.

However, the USA unilaterally broke off the talks and refused to renew them because military detente in the Indian Ocean was not in keeping with the aggressive plans of American imperialism.

Nevertheless, the USSR has repeatedly expressed readiness to resume the talks at once. "During his 1986 visit to India, Mikhail Gorbachev declared that the Soviet Union was ready at any time to hold talks with the USA and the other hinterland states which have warships permanently in the Indian Ocean on a substantial cut in the size and activity of their navies. It was also proposed to hold talks with the USA and interested Asian countries on military confidence-

building measures in Asia and the adjacent areas of the Indian and Pacific Oceans, for example notification of the movement and manoeuvres of the land (amphibious), naval and air forces of those countries.”<sup>1</sup>

Of course, the USSR must bear in mind imperialism’s greatly invigorated aggressive preparations, one vast sphere of which is the Indian Ocean, a circumstance which poses a real threat to Soviet security from the south, making reinforced defences a necessary addition to the efforts to maintain peace and lessen the nuclear war danger. That is why the USSR periodically sends to the Indian Ocean limited naval forces whose presence serves to check imperialist aggression.

An important part of an Indian Ocean zone of peace is a ban on the deployment of nuclear weapons. It is appropriate to recall that the Soviet position on a security system in the Indian Ocean began to take shape when the proposal was made to set up a nuclear-free zone there. In 1964 the USSR expressed its positive attitude to the future nuclear-free principle of a zone of peace by supporting the littoral states’ initiative, a stance which has subsequently been confirmed on more than one occasion. The Soviet Union has never deployed nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean and believes that a general undertaking to that effect is essential for a zone of peace.

Thus, the USSR’s approach to a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean has always been positive and constructive and coincides in the fundamental aspects with the general position of the non-aligned countries. True to this policy, the Soviet Union seeks to cooperate with all advocates of a zone of peace in the practical implementation of this initiative. For example, Soviet representatives have been participating actively in the preparations for an international conference on the Indian Ocean along with representatives of the other socialist community countries and non-aligned countries, whose convocation is now a pivot of the effort to create a zone of peace. Attaching paramount importance to military and political stability in the region, the USSR proposes greater safety for navigation and air traffic, guaranteed sovereignty of coastal countries over their natural resources, and

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 28 November 1986.

the combating of terrorism directed against international navigation and civil aviation.

Much experience has been gained in elaborating and realising the zone of peace initiative, experience which could be useful in the implementation of the other similar initiatives by the non-aligned countries.

It is extremely important to create a zone of peace in the Mediterranean, which joins three continents, is of importance for transport, and has great economic and military strategic significance. A feature of the situation in the Mediterranean is the constant build-up of NATO military preparations. In 1984 a new element of the build-up was the deployment of US medium-range missiles on the territory of a Mediterranean state—Italy—and an increase in the size of the imperialist fleets. The US-backed aggressive Israeli actions have prevented a settlement of the Middle East conflict. The American Sixth Fleet took a direct part in the air and sea bombardment of Lebanon and has also repeatedly carried out armed provocations against another Mediterranean state—Libya. The Cyprus problem remains acute.

A zone of peace would help to stabilise the situation in the Mediterranean region, eliminate the existing conflicts, and create the necessary conditions for strengthening regional peace and security. This would be greatly furthered by implementation of the special section on the Mediterranean formulated with the active participation of the European non-aligned countries and included in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The document states that “security in Europe is to be considered in the broader context of world security and is closely linked with security in the Mediterranean area as a whole, and that accordingly the process of improving security should not be confined to Europe but should extend to other parts of the world, and in particular to the Mediterranean area.”<sup>1</sup>

The non-aligned countries’ idea of turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation was advanced in 1973. The fourth summit conference supported the efforts of the non-aligned countries of the region to establish such a zone on the basis of respect for the interested countries and

<sup>1</sup> *Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Final Act, Helsinki, 1975, p. 111.*

non-interference in their internal affairs. In advancing this initiative, the non-aligned countries pointed to the connection between the situation in the region and the general European process, events in the Middle East and the problem of Cyprus. This approach was confirmed at all subsequent non-aligned forums, including the 1983 Delhi conference.

In September 1984 the Foreign Ministers of Mediterranean non-aligned countries adopted a final declaration on the results of their meeting in Valletta (Malta). They not only wanted to establish a zone of peace, security and cooperation in the Mediterranean but were worried by the actions of imperialist forces, which were making the regional situation more complicated. The ministers expressed profound concern over the US provocations against Libya, stating that they represent a threat to international security and world peace. The document condemned the "strategic alliance" between Israel and the USA, which has been encouraging the Zionists to continue their policy of racism, occupation, annexation and aggression.<sup>1</sup>

At the present stage, non-aligned documents contain only the most general elements of a zone of peace and cooperation in the Mediterranean which, it is proposed, should be based on the following principles: respect for national independence and sovereignty, non-use of force, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality of states, expansion of cooperation between Mediterranean countries, reduction in the presence of navies, an end to the Israeli aggression and elimination of its effects.

Supporting this non-aligned initiative, the Soviet Union, in its turn, has put forward a package of proposals which specify and develop it. It should be recalled that as back as 1963 the USSR advanced a project for turning the entire Mediterranean region into a nuclear-free zone. The far-reaching Soviet initiatives also envisage a withdrawal of American and Soviet navies from the Mediterranean, the creation of a chemical weapon-free zone there, and later the convocation of a meeting similar to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Taken as a package, the proposals of the non-aligned

<sup>1</sup> See *UN Document A/39/526*, 27 September 1984.

countries and the Soviet Union, which accord with the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in whose formulation on the basis of consensus several non-aligned states participated, could be the basis for a concrete programme for a zone of peace and cooperation in the Mediterranean.

The non-aligned movement as a whole also supports ASEAN's proclamation of Southeast Asia as a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, which is contained in the 27 November 1971 Kuala Lumpur Declaration. This zone would embrace not only the ASEAN countries, i.e. Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines, and since 1984, Brunei, but also the other states in the region. Addressing the first special UN General Assembly session on disarmament, the Malaysian representative said: 'The concept of zones of peace envisages the establishment of conditions which would be conducive to promoting peace, friendship, mutual trust and co-operation among States within the region... The ultimate goal of our zonal concept is the attainment of peace, security and stability for Southeast Asia... However, we do recognize that this would depend on the agreement of all countries in the region. It is for this reason that my Government recognizes the need to undertake consultations with the other countries concerned to clarify the proposal and to gain their understanding of and respect for the proposal and eventually their agreement to it.'<sup>1</sup>

However, in practice the actions of certain ASEAN circles raise obstacles to equitable and goodneighbourly relations with the states of Indo-China, which are active non-aligned members, one such obstacle being the so-called Kampuchean problem. In 1979, the people of Kampuchea toppled the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary puppet regime, which had usurped power soon after the 1975 victory of the Indo-Chinese peoples in the war against imperialist aggression. The world community hailed the downfall of Pol Pot and the formation of the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK), which has been successfully tackling the problems of national reconstruction and development. But the imperialist states and a

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly. Tenth Special Session Plenary Meetings. Verbatim Records of the Meetings. Ad Hoc Committee of the Tenth Special Session. Annexes. 23 May-30 June 1978, United Nations, New York, 1981, p. 213.*

number of other states, ASEAN members among them, have been doing everything to impede socio-economic transformations in the PRK, taking measures to prevent restoration of the PRK's legitimate rights in the UN, and giving enormous material, moral and political aid and support to the Pol Pot bands that have entrenched themselves in Thailand, from where they have been carrying out large-scale subversion against the young republic.

These actions by the Khmer reactionaries, backed by imperialism and hegemonism, hinder the creation of the necessary situation for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. The way to a real security measure, which a peace zone could be, is to establish equitable cooperation between ASEAN and the countries of Indo-China, which is essential for a viable regional security system. Pursuing an active and constructive foreign policy, in 1981 the three Indo-Chinese states advanced a joint initiative aimed to improve the situation in Southeast Asia and create a zone of peace, stability and goodneighbourliness, its essence being that problems and disagreements between the two groups of states in the region should be resolved through direct dialogue with no outside interference whatsoever. This initiative was set out in greater detail in a memorandum distributed at the 36th UN General Assembly session by the Laotian Foreign Minister and entitled "Basic principles of peaceful co-existence between the two groups of countries of Indo-China and ASEAN for the purpose of peace, stability, friendship and cooperation in Southeast Asia". It proposed both measures to normalise political relations between the countries of the region based on the principles of the UN Charter, and concrete ways to establish socio-economic cooperation between them and set up a permanent consultative body.

As was manifested in the proposal to create a security zone on both sides of the Thai-Kampuchean border, the Indo-Chinese states also favour a gradual normalisation of relations in Southeast Asia. The gradual pullout of units of Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea, which is to be completed by 1990, is an act of goodwill and an important confidence-building measure.

The Indo-China states consistently advocate a regional or broader international conference on Southeast Asia. Still in force is their proposal to conclude with ASEAN countries



bilateral or multilateral treaties on non-aggression and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

The problems of Southeast Asia have been a focus of attention of non-aligned countries since 1964 when the Cairo summit adopted a Programme of Peace and International Cooperation which expressed concern over the heightened tension in Indo-China caused by the imperialist armed intervention. Neither was the movement indifferent and neutral toward the just struggle of the peoples of Indo-China against the imperialist aggression. And in 1976 the fifth summit hailed the historic victory of Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos, describing it as a factor promoting non-alignment and "a great contribution to the common struggle of the peoples of the non-aligned countries and other progressive peoples in the world against the common enemy, namely imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism, and for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress."<sup>1</sup>

The 1972 Foreign Ministers Conference in Georgetown and the 1973 fourth summit in Algiers positively assessed the Kuala Lumpur Declaration mentioned earlier.

The political section of the Delhi Declaration of the 1981 Foreign Ministers Conference also put forward the proposal for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in Southeast Asia and called on all states fully to support it. These propositions were later reproduced in the materials of the seventh and eighth conferences.

It is apparent, however, that the non-aligned approach to the concept of a zone of peace in Southeast Asia is to a large extent patterned off the ASEAN initiative and does not take account of the interests of Indo-China. This is a result of the negative influence of the circles which magnify the "Kampuchean problem" and thereby hinder the restoration of the PRK's legitimate right to non-aligned membership and the adoption by the movement of a more balanced and objective approach to the establishment of a zone of peace in Southeast Asia. It is clear that there are still substantial political and diplomatic reserves for creating a full-fledged zone of peace and stability in the region, one necessary step being to correct the word "neutrality" (in the ASEAN pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 199.

posal), which is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the non-aligned movement.

Finally, the Pacific. The fourth non-aligned summit stated that "the creation of a zone of peace on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter is liable to reduce tension, eliminate foreign military presence and promote peaceful cooperation among interested countries."<sup>1</sup> In line with this decision, the 1975 Lima Foreign Ministers Conference recommended the creation in the South Pacific Ocean of "a Peaceful Cooperation and Peace Zone so that the ocean areas be free from the use of force" and deemed it advisable that "the necessary consultations among the countries of the region be carried out" and that the zone of peace itself be assessed as "an actual contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security."<sup>2</sup>

Peace and security in the vast Pacific region has long been of concern to the progressive forces, and, as noted earlier, the USSR proposed as early as 1959 that a zone of peace should be created there.

Non-aligned materials do not contain any instructions on further concretising its proposal, whose realisation would undoubtedly enhance peace and security not only in the South Pacific but in the Pacific basin as a whole. This is all the more important because the imperialist states, the USA and their allies, are turning this vast region into a zone of dangerous confrontation. The existing military and political blocs are becoming more active, and attempts are being made to establish new military alliances and give ASEAN military functions. The White House has stated that it wants to create a new secret military and political grouping with the euphonic name of "Pacific Community". Large fleets of the USA and other imperialist powers have already been deployed in the ocean. Large-scale military manoeuvres and exercises are often held there, with Japan taking an increasingly active part.

That is why in this region, as in the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, there are many difficulties hampering the establishment of a zone of peace. Greater activity on the part of the non-aligned movement to implement its own ini-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

tiative could do much to remove the threat to peace and security in the region. It should be noted that, as in the case of the proposal for a Mediterranean zone of peace, the socialist countries have also advanced a whole package of specific and far-reaching initiatives to improve the situation in the Pacific.

It will be recalled that as far back as the early 1930s the Soviet Union proposed to the United States, Japan and China that all four countries conclude a non-aggression pact, but Washington and Tokyo rejected that Moscow initiative.

Recently the USSR has put forward broad package of initiatives aimed to include the vast Asian and Pacific region in the general process of creating a comprehensive international security system. In the view of the USSR, the concept of Asian security could be based on the five Panchsheel and the ten Bandung principles, and on the implementation of a number of peace proposals of socialist and non-aligned countries of that region.

In 1981 the Mongolian People's Republic made a major proposal to conclude an international convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states. Based on the universally accepted principles of international law and according with the UN Charter, the convention would include the following important undertakings:

a) take joint and individual measures to enhance trust and mutual understanding and reduce military confrontation between states;

b) jointly consider measures to prevent a surprise attack;

c) actively participate in elaborating measures to end the arms race and implement effective disarmament measures;

d) hold consultations to resolve regional disputes;

e) hold talks in a spirit of goodwill on eliminating seats of tension and conflict;

f) jointly take measures to strengthen the UN as a universal instrument of collective security.

Realisation of the Mongolian proposal through the pooled efforts of socialist, non-aligned and other peace-loving states would certainly improve the political climate in the Pacific and help to create a real zone of peace, security and cooperation. That is also the aim of the DPRK proposals to normalise the situation on the Korean Peninsula and turn it

into a nuclear-free zone of peace. Noteworthy, too, are the recent proposals to create a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. The 1985 Treaty on a Nuclear-Free Zone in the South Pacific shows that it is possible to realise these initiatives. As Mikhail Gorbachev stated in summer 1986 in Vladivostok, "The USSR supports a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific and urges all nuclear powers to guarantee its status unilaterally or multilaterally."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the question of whether or not there are to be zones of peace, above all in the Indian Ocean, is now a very acute one. The reasons are fairly obvious: the global one—the drastic worsening of the overall international situation; and regional ones—the imperialist-created epicentres of tension precisely in the regions of proposed peace zones and first and foremost in the vast Indian Ocean, and especially in the northwestern area of it—the Persian Gulf. The resolution of this question now depends to a great extent on the very initiators of the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean—the non-aligned countries, on how consistently they abide by the fundamental principles of the movement and carry out the tasks set by the movement itself in connection with the zone of peace. Success is quite possible. The continuing popularity of these initiatives is evidenced by the resolution adopted by the 41st UN General Assembly session declaring the South Atlantic a zone of peace and cooperation. A number of Latin American and African non-aligned countries joined Brazil, which made the initiative, in formulating the proposal. However, even greater progress will be made if the movement displays political realism and vigilance, and if it is able to unify its ranks and cooperate with world socialism and all peace-loving and anti-imperialist forces.

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 29 July 1986.

### The Non-Aligned Movement and Restructuring of International Economic Relations

The restructuring of international economic relations, above all in the form of a new international economic order, is an important and independent goal of the non-aligned movement. "The Heads of State or Government," says the Economic Declaration of the seventh conference in Delhi, "regard their efforts in this direction as an integral part of the general struggle of their peoples for political, economic, cultural and social liberation."<sup>1</sup> The movement has tackled foreign economic matters from the very outset, and these became increasingly decisive and on a level with political problems as the former colonies gained independence.

This course of events is quite natural. Lenin distinguished two successive stages in the liberation movement—the struggle for political and then for economic liberation, the latter making the former real and lasting.<sup>2</sup> For that reason, once the young states had put an end to colonial oppression, they immediately placed on the agenda the surmounting of their economic backwardness, and that cannot be achieved without changing their unequal and dependent position in the world capitalist economic system.

There are at least three reasons why it is necessary for the non-aligned movement to seek a restructuring of international economic relations.

First, all these countries, bar none, are heavily dependent on the external market and foreign sources of capital and technology. UN experts calculate that 26 of them export more than a half of their GNP, and 66—more than a quarter. Despite a greater variety of exported goods there is, as a

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> See: Lenin, "The Special Significance of the Serbo-Bulgarian Victories", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973, p. 398.

rule, still one-product export, which is decisive for the key sectors of the economy. Parallel with this, these countries import a sizable part of the material and technical means necessary for economic growth, and foreign funds account for a large part of accumulation. More than 40 non-aligned countries import most of their food. And although the progress made over the years of independence has meant that the reproduction process has begun increasingly to rest on a national base, import is, to a large extent, still the primary subsector of social production, and export is the sphere of realisation of what is produced. For many non-aligned states international production relations, especially in the leading economic sectors, are today therefore as important as local ones and determine the character and type of those states' economic and social development as a whole. The interests of independent development consequently make it vital to change those relations.

Second, such great dependence on external markets is, under the capitalist economic system, a main prerequisite for the continuing neocolonial exploitation of those countries along the channels of foreign economic ties. It is largely for that reason that despite the quite definite successes in developing the national economy, non-aligned countries have not yet been able to attain many of their socio-economic objectives and continue to pay economic tribute to their former colonialists. To be specific, these countries did not fully achieve the objectives of either the First or the Second United Nations Development Decade, and it is quite likely that the result will be the same for the Third Decade as well. Also virtually unfulfilled are the goals set by the developing countries in the 1972 Lima Declaration (increase their share of world industrial production to 25% and of world industrial export to 30% by the year 2000). According to the most optimistic forecasts, these goals are expected to be met by barely two-thirds by the year 2000. It is therefore urgent for the non-aligned movement to oppose the neocolonial exploitation that is part and parcel of their economic ties with the imperialist centres.

Third, the very same unequal relations imposed on the non-aligned countries by imperialism are regularly used as channels for transferring to the developing world the crises and disproportions affecting those centres. In years of crisis,

the damage caused by events beyond the control and responsibility of the developing countries is thus added to the "normal", daily burden of exploitation. This made it especially felt during the series of economic crises of the 1970s-1980s. "It is a crisis that has its origins in the major capitalist powers but has more brutally affected the underdeveloped countries," Fidel Castro said in his report to the seventh non-aligned conference, "which are now experiencing the sharpest economic deterioration in the whole post-war period."<sup>1</sup>

The Conference Economic Declaration pointed out that for the first time since the Second World War, there has been a decline in the per capita GNP of many developing countries. In real terms agricultural and raw material prices were the lowest in the last 50 years. The economic declaration of the eighth conference noted with alarm: "The widening gap between the developed and developing countries and the persistence of the unjust and inequitable international economic system constitute a major impediment to the development process of non-aligned and other developing countries and pose a serious threat to international peace and security."<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, between 1960 and 1970, of the 98 developing countries covered by World Bank figures only three had a fall in exports—and that because of extraordinary circumstances, while between 1970 and 1980 27 had an export fall and 57 were affected by a drop in the purchasing power of those exports. Equally, 63 of the 69 countries examined in 1981 had a balance of payments deficit. The total foreign debt of the developing countries rose from \$184 billion in 1975 to \$1 trillion in 1985, making up a quarter of the annual GNP of 45 (out of the 79 countries examined), of 19—more than a half, and of 5—over three-quarters. In 1984 those countries spent about 29% of their export earnings on debt repayments, as against 13% in 1970. Noting that the measures and proposals for solving these problems are clearly unsatisfactory, the Conference stressed that there can be no equitable and viable system of international economic cooperation without a basic and fundamental

<sup>1</sup> F. Castro, *The World Economic and Social Crisis. Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> UN Document A/41/697, 14 October 1986, p. 167.

change in the approaches and policies of the developed countries with respect to the establishment of the New International Economic Order (NIEO).

The forementioned reasons also underlie the specific features of the question of a new international economic order in the non-aligned programmes.

First of all, and this is fundamentally important, the NIEO is the slogan of the *collective* efforts of the non-aligned countries based on their community of interests. Furthermore, this community on the road of economic decolonisation unites other developing countries with the non-aligned ones, increases the movement's membership, and creates the basis for cooperation between the movement and the Group of 77 as the instrument of the developing countries' economic diplomacy at the UN. Taken together the non-aligned states presently constitute almost a half of the world population. And although they account for a mere 14% of the world GNP, they hold 69% of UN seats, and with the other developing countries they hold three-quarters of them. That is why collective non-aligned actions draw a very strong response internationally and are much more effective than any individual diplomatic demarche could be.

The struggle for a NIEO is therefore one of the internal forces cementing non-aligned unity. As such, this factor also plays an independent progressive role for any anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle is strengthened by its unity.

It is also very important that in the non-aligned movement the NIEO slogan is not seen as a narrowly economic one but as part of the fight for decolonisation and democratisation of international relations as a whole, and in recent times in direct connection also with the most acute global problems of our day, above all the problem of preserving peace. The Political Declaration of the Delhi conference makes special note that the non-aligned countries "have also striven for the elimination of *all forms* (my emphasis—*Author*) of domination, discrimination, exploitation and inequality and for the establishment of a new world order based on respect for independence, equality and co-operation and the fulfilment of the aspirations of all peoples for justice, security, development and prosperity."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UN Document A/38/132, p. 9.



This interpretation on the whole imparts to the struggle for a NIEO the anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and democratic content which is a feature of the progressive phenomena of the present epoch, although, as will later be shown, this struggle is proceeding in fairly complicated and contradictory forms, against the background of the differentiation within the non-aligned movement itself. In addition, in its fight for socio-economic objectives the movement has now been able largely to overcome its former underestimation of the organic link between development and detente. While some non-aligned members used to regard the latter as exclusively a great power concern, an interpretation which placed non-alignment in the artificial position of "neutrality" on questions of war and peace or raised the far-fetched thesis of "development and then detente", the movement's latest documents now contain politically more mature assessments of that interconnection. "Peace and development," says the Economic Declaration of the seventh conference, "are interrelated... Stable global development and viable international order require the halting of the arms race, followed by urgent disarmament measures that will release sorely needed resources for development."<sup>1</sup> And though many non-aligned members still have their own peculiar way of interpreting the interrelation between detente and development, on the whole this changing assessment is evidence of the progressive development of the movement's position.

Finally, let us examine the conceptual basis of the NIEO itself. Both the non-aligned movement and the Group of 77 see it primarily as an instrument for changing their present unsatisfactory position in the world, and above all in the capitalist, economic system. The New Delhi Message says that "non-aligned countries are committed to strive for the establishment of the New International Economic Order based on justice and equity."<sup>2</sup>

The authors of the NIEO believe that the way to achieve that is for the developed countries to set up a system of trade and economic privileges for the developing countries, a system which would be unilateral and non-reciprocal and

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> UN Document A/38/132, p. 57.

would eventually ensure that the two main objectives are attained: rapid mustering of the resources of the developing countries themselves as the basis for their development and the permanent transfer to them of additional external resources from the developed countries' national income by redistributing a certain part of it through trade and financial channels. Such a transfer mechanism should operate regardless of the economic situation and should be effected via purposeful changes in the world economy in favour of the developing countries. All this is expected to be achieved through political decisions, primarily within the UN framework.

In other words, it is the external international *relations of distribution* that are the target for transformation under the NIEO, this being carried out via reforms.

How is this restructuring to be effected?

Since its original publication in the form of the Declaration of the fourth summit conference (Algiers, 1973), a number of details of the NIEO have been modified and there is therefore no single official text. However, the composition and the essence of its proposals for the early 1980s remain basically the same and may be summarised as follows.

In spite of the obvious achievements in industrialisation, raw materials still account for three-quarters of the exports of developing countries, and some of those countries in fact export nothing but raw material. It is therefore not surprising that the NIEO programme gives priority to stabilising the raw material trade and raising the earnings of raw material exporters. A solution to these problems is also made urgent by the fact that during the 1981-83 crisis the volume of raw material and fuel exports from the developing countries fell appreciably while the raw material prices dropped by 40% and in real terms were the lowest for the past 50 years.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, non-aligned documents propose as a remedy an Integrated Programme for Commodities, namely the conclusion of international trade agreements on the 18 principal raw material exports to stabilise the markets by prompt manoeuvring of "buffer stocks" which would

<sup>1</sup> UNCTAD. *Trade and Development Report, 1983*, Report by the Secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations, New York, 1983, pp. 3-4.

absorb the surplus when supply is high and be a source of additional goods when demand is high, thereby keeping price fluctuations within certain limits. A "Common Fund" would finance these operations. In addition, it is recommended to expand raw material processing at the site of extraction, invigorate the associations of exporter countries, and introduce "indexation" of raw material prices by "linking" them to the price index of the manufactured goods imported by the developing countries. The NIEO programme also calls for expanded compensatory financing of raw material producers by the IMF in the event of a sharp fall in their export earnings. Finally, non-aligned documents demand the abolition of tariffs and internal taxes on raw materials in the importer countries so as to make them more accessible to the consumer.

At the same time, a growing number of developing countries are beginning to export a greater share of *manufactured goods*. For an absolute majority of them this makes their industrialisation and technical modernisation more dependent on foreign markets since their own markets are too narrow for large-scale industrial production.

In order to facilitate manufactured exports from the developing to the developed countries, the non-aligned movement demands a general lowering of protectionist barriers, non-escalation of customs tariff rates in proportion to the extent of processing of the import, and continuation and expansion of the general preferential system. Introduced in developed countries in the mid-1970s, this system places low or zero tariffs on manufactured imports from the developing countries, these favourable terms being unilateral and unconditional. Hence the demand that the sphere of operation of these privileges should not be narrowed, that they should not be cancelled or devalued through the introduction of non-tariff restrictions, that the principle of unconditionality should be maintained, that there should be no discrimination in the allocation of tariff preferentials, etc. An argument advanced is the fact that in 1982 and 1983 there was a sharp fall in the growth rate of manufactured exports from the young states because protectionist barriers were reraised.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UNCTAD. *Trade and Development Report, 1983*, United Nations, New York, 1983, p. 35.

In broader terms, the Havana and Delhi Declarations demand that the developed countries take measures to adapt their economies structurally to the growing industrial imports from the developing countries, measures which should include the moving to the latter countries of some "lower floor" of manufacturing and technologically simple labour-intensive and material-intensive productions.

In a number of instances the economic platform of the non-aligned movement goes beyond the main points of the NIEO to additional demands in related areas, for example, food supplies to the developing countries. Regarding each person's right to satisfy his food requirements as "a fundamental and universal human right", the movement believes that it is humanity's common duty to eradicate hunger.<sup>1</sup> In this connection it is noted that in a number of developing countries per capita grain production is falling, partly as a result of the drought which started between 1983 and 1984 in some equatorial regions, and that imports are increasing. In recent decades imports have doubled in volume and quadrupled in cost, and their commercial component has increased at the expense of food aid, the majority of starving countries being unable, given the critical shortage of hard currency, to finance such imports in the necessary volume.

That is why non-aligned documents demand a special fund within IMF to finance grain imports, a creation of international emergency stores, of an international food insurance system and an increase in food aid to 18.5 million tons annually. In addition, the movement wants more liberal terms for the food trade, guaranteed deliveries for the developing countries with a constant food shortage, especially for the least developed countries, and an international programme to eradicate hunger and malnutrition by the year 2000.

With the worst phase of the energy crisis over, the movement has been paying somewhat less attention to the question of fuel and energy resources for the developing countries, but its latest documents emphasise that difficulties remain in this area. Specifically, the developing countries make much greater use than do the developed countries of

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 91.

the most expensive energy source—oil. In those countries the measures which eased the energy crisis in the West have not yet been taken and the GNP unit of the developing countries continues to be increasingly power-consuming, partly as a result of the transfer there of a number of power-consuming productions and the greater processing of raw materials at the site of extraction. Finally, because of their income level, the oil-exporting countries were an isolated special grouping in the developing world, at least in the 1970s, and their pricing policy was repeatedly severely criticised by the movement for being a threat to its unity.

Non-aligned documents therefore do not include a detailed programme in this area, merely stating the need for OPEC to give priority to supplying the rest of the developing world at stable prices, for the speedy introduction of alternative energy sources on their territories, more economic aid from OPEC, World Bank financing for the development of electric power industries (by creating specialised offices there for that purpose) and IMP financing of energy imports. In other respects, the movement hopes that further oil savings in the developed countries will not aggravate the energy crisis anew and will leave enough fuel for the developing countries at stable prices.

While the non-aligned movement's main diplomatic efforts in the 1970s were aimed at stabilising raw material markets, in the 1980s, with the failure of those efforts forcing many developing countries to live in debt, the movement's attention turned to *fiscal and monetary problems*. "Throughout the last ten years," Fidel Castro stated in his report to the seventh non-aligned summit, "the economies of the Third World countries have been particularly hard hit by the disintegration of the system of fixed exchange rates, the appearance of enormous deficits in the balance of payments in their current accounts, galloping inflation and shortages of financial resources that can be used under acceptable conditions—with this phenomenon exacerbated by an excessive increase in interest rates and the resulting unprecedented rise in their external debts."<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, during the years of the crisis the volume of official aid for development from the West fell to 0.33%

<sup>1</sup> F. Castro, *The World Economic and Social Crisis. Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 77.

of GNP in 1977 and 0.39% in 1982, as against 0.51% in 1960, while the balance of payments deficit on current accounts alone, not to mention development needs, exceeded \$100 billion annually. The share of this official aid in the total volume of funds transferred to the developing countries fell to 28% in the 1970s, while the share of private investment, which means an outflow of profits and interest on private bank loans often made at 18-20%, rose to 14% and approximately 50% respectively. The terms of financing became much tougher. Even for official development aid, which is regarded in the West as "noncommercial" and "advantageous", interest went up from 2.8-6.9% to 4.4-14% (depending on the category of the borrower) in 1970-1981, while the term of loans was reduced from 13-30 years to 11-30 years, and the grace period from 3-9 years to 4-7 years.

Under these conditions, the NIEO programme demands that the developed countries raise the net volume of funds to the developing countries to one per cent of their GNP, with 0.7% being official concessional development aid. It proposes that the aid terms should again be liberalised, that the share of subsidies should be increased, that the World Bank and IMF operational funds should be expanded, including for low interest aid, and that a part of the loans or interest payments owed by the least developed countries and by those states hardest hit by the crisis should be written off. The programme also calls for more loan rescheduling, granting of additional funds to the developing countries for loan repayment, including via the IMF, for considering a part of the repaid bank loans as the category of official development aid, etc.

With respect to *monetary* matters, the two principal problems facing the developing countries are insufficient liquid funds and the anti-democratic practices of the IMF, which is dominated by Western countries, with the developing countries virtually left out of decision-making. For that reason, the Delhi Economic Declaration speaks of "the need to create a new, equitable and universal international monetary system which would put an end to the dominance of certain reserve currencies, guarantee developing countries a role in decision-making, while ensuring monetary and financial discipline in the developed countries

and preferential treatment for developing countries.”<sup>1</sup>

An argument in favour of these demands is that in 1982 IMF credit to developing countries with unfavourable balance of payments was a miserly \$4.8 billion, even while the loan terms are getting tougher. Thus, the share of “regular credits” at interest rates close to market rates and with an undertaking by the borrower country to adjust their fiscal and monetary policy, rose from 65% in 1978-1980 to 95% in 1981-1982. The annual limit on these credits has been cut from 150% to 102-125% of their quota in the IMF, and credits through compensation financing from 100% to 83% of the quota. There has also been repeated discrimination in the granting of credits against “unsuitable” countries, including for political reasons.

Accordingly, the non-aligned movement demands a doubling of the IMF quotas, additional sums under SDR over and above those proportions determined by the Fund quotas, removal of the restrictions on access to IMF credit funds, greater participation in running the fund, account of the special economic and social conditions of the debtor countries, and a ban on political discrimination against borrowers.

*Science and technology* have an extremely important role to play in speeding up the developing countries’ economic growth and in restructuring their economy, but it is in this area that a situation has taken shape which is justly described as “technological neo-colonialism”. Underlying it is TNC resistance to the creation of a local base of science and technology in the young countries, and the monopolies’ desire to keep these countries totally dependent on the import of technology. In its turn, this dependence is also used as a means of ensuring profits through the transfer of technology and as a means of pressuring the newly-independent countries to accept foreign private capital and of effecting political discrimination against unsuitable regimes.

In fact, R&D has virtually no place among Western “aid” projects, and TNC enterprises in the developing countries are set up, as a rule, without laboratory or experimental departments. As a result, these countries account for barely 3% of world R&D spending and only 5% of the world patent fund. Also largely wasted are the funds which

<sup>1</sup> UN Document A/38/132, p. 68.

young states spend on training national specialists for thousands of them are enticed by the TNCs to emigrate to the base country. India, Angola, Egypt, Iraq, Algeria, Benin, Libya and Guyana have more than once been refused new technology (even under contracts already concluded) as "punishment" for their independent political course. In 85% of cases new technology goes to TNC subsidiaries or comes in a "package" with their capital, which is tantamount to forced acceptance. Finally, the transfer of technology is made on numerous restrictive terms which either tie the hands of the national companies or overstate the price of the deal, which is why the NIEO programme was initially aimed primarily at normalising the terms for import of technology. Developing countries, including non-aligned ones, demanded the adoption of an international code of behaviour establishing progressive, equitable and non-discriminatory norms for such transfer, excluding restrictive business practice, and fixing special advantages for developing countries in the international technological exchange. They also called for reform of the international patent system, which, among other things, implied banning the TNCs from abusing their patent rights in developing countries.

Of course, for many years to come import will be the principal source of technology for a developing economy and it is therefore important to normalise and democratise its terms. However, non-aligned countries, indeed all developing countries, are increasingly convinced that the ultimate way to achieve technological independence cannot be through import, which regularly reproduces dependence in this area, but only through the creation of a local scientific and technological potential, including on a collective basis. Since the 1980s the movement has been giving greater priority to this direction, and the NIEO programme is backed and developed by the Vienna action programme approved by the 1979 UN Conference on Science and Technology and specified in a number of decisions of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO).

In this connection the non-aligned countries demand implementation of the Vienna action programme, the drafting of a strategy for technological transformation of developing countries, greater aid to the developing countries to



create their own scientific potential, and measures to reduce the brain drain or compensate the developing countries for the loss.

A key provision of the NIEO, and a principle of non-alignment as a whole, is respect for the national *sovereignty* of states over their natural resources and economic activity. The non-aligned movement stands firmly on this as a matter of principle. The Economic Declaration of the seventh conference says that "some developed countries and their transnationals which were using economic coercion, pressure and blackmail undermined the sovereignty and fundamental right of the developing countries to pursue their own independent economic policies and programmes."<sup>1</sup>

As part of the struggle to eradicate colonialism, the movement demands that recognition of such sovereignty be granted to those peoples still under colonial domination or foreign occupation, and "whose natural resources were illegally plundered and exploited."<sup>2</sup> At the same time it wants this sovereignty extended to the resources of the shelf and the world ocean in accordance with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and opposes any unilateral actions by the imperialist states which are inconsistent with that Convention.

Because the main danger to the sovereignty of states which have gained economic independence is posed by TNCs, the movement pays close attention to the specific features of their activity. Today, these conglomerates control up to 50% of world capitalist trade and market 80-90% of the most important commodities.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore in spite of the economic crisis, in recent years the expansion of TNC capital to the developing countries has gone ahead more rapidly than the interconnecting of capital between industrially developed countries.<sup>4</sup>

For that reason the movement upholds the right of sovereign states to control and regulate TNC activity in the national interests, even by nationalising them, and demands early completion of the international code of behaviour for

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *UNCTAD Statistical Pocketbook*, United Nations, New York, 1984, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations. Transnational Corporations in World Development. Third Survey*, New York, 1983, pp. 2,3.

TNCs being drafted in the UN, anti-corruption measures, including international ones, and the elaboration of international standards for reports on their activity. Of special importance in the programme are the demands for prevention of TNC interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign states in which they operate, and an end to support for reactionary regimes, above all the racist South African regime.

Originally advanced as a more or less unified programme for all developed countries, the NIEO programme then felt the effects of the differentiation in their ranks. Since the late 1970s, non-aligned documents have paid particular attention to the problems of the *least developed countries* (which, unlike the relatively more developed ones, are practically all members of the movement), the countries hardest hit by the crisis, and island and continental states.

In keeping with UN standards, the movement regards as the least developed the 36 states of Asia, Africa, Oceania and Latin America with the lowest indicators of per capita income, and industrial and cultural development. "The 36 countries designated as least developed, 26 of which were African, recorded no growth at all over their level in 1980," says the Delhi Economic Declaration. "The situation of those in the Sahel region was desperate. Other developing countries, particularly the low-income ones among them faced a harsh—even hostile—external environment in their efforts to eliminate extreme poverty and to provide appropriate standards of living for their populations."<sup>1</sup> In other words, the least developed countries are now the movement's weakest link politically and economically as well.

It is therefore a principle of the movement to give those countries prompt and large grants and a fixed share of the resources received, and to take a number of special measures not applied to the other developing countries. Specifically, this means the demands for financial aid on the most favourable terms (up to 100% subsidies), the earmarking for those countries of 0.15% of the GNP of the developed countries as part of their total official development aid,

<sup>1</sup> UN Document A/38/132, p. 68.

additional advantages in the general preferential system and the compensation schemes for reductions in export earnings, the writing off of debts and interest payments, etc. It is underscored that such differentiated or additional advantages should not be used to bring political pressure to bear on those countries.

With respect to the 45 countries hardest hit by the crisis, the movement demands that specific measures be taken for them as part of the earlier formulated general demands of the NIEO programme. In relation to the island states, these demands mean more liberal terms for shipment, and in relation to continental states—easier overland transit.

Under the impact of developments in the world economy and as experience was gained in implementing the NIEO, the programme's emphases and formulations have undergone certain changes. Thus, having failed to implement the "integrated raw material programme" described earlier, the movement is now concentrating on obtaining broader compensatory financing, the processing of raw materials at the site of extraction, and control over the transportation and sale of raw materials. In the fiscal and monetary sphere, emphasis has shifted from reform of the international monetary system to allotment to the developing countries of additional special drawing rights, and in the financial sphere from more official development aid to settlement of the debt problem. In the trading of manufactured goods, the movement considers its main current task to be that of preventing a further growth of protectionism on the markets of the developed capitalist countries and to get them to import more from the developing countries. It is also considered important to prevent the erosion of the preferential regime for their exports, which the Western countries are trying to achieve by applying the principles of "gradation" or "selectivity". In the forefront in the transfer of technology is the problem of the technological restructuring of the developing countries, including via the creation of local scientific potential. Finally, with respect to the least developed countries the priority remains more official aid on easier terms. However, whatever its priorities, as Robert Mugabe stated at the eighth conference, the "establishment of the New International Economic Order, based on justice, equity and sovereign equality, remains an absolute necessity

of our time.”<sup>1</sup>

Such is the NIEO programme as set out in non-aligned documents. Consequently, the question arises as to the extent to which the movement and the Group of 77 have common positions on the NIEO programme, and the existing mechanism for coordinating their activity.

Non-aligned documents often contain direct tasks for the Group of 77 at international forums. For example, the Delhi Economic Declaration contained such tasks for UNCTAD-VI in Belgrade, for the Group of 77 ministers at the 38th UN General Assembly session.<sup>2</sup> “The Ministers request the Group of 77,” said the Declaration of the April 1983 Buenos Aires Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77, “to take the necessary initiatives without delay in the organizations concerned of the United Nations system.”<sup>3</sup>

Yet the relations between the non-aligned movement and the Group of 77 should not be oversimplified or presented onesidedly, like a vector from “headquarters” to a “field army” carrying out its directives. These two formations have both political and organisational and technical differences, and the connection between them does not run in one direction only but is a two-way one reflecting the changing balance of forces not only between them but also inside each of the organisations.

To begin with, the non-aligned movement is above all a political movement that deals with the entire range of present-day international problems, while the Group of 77 confines itself largely to trade policy, or even just to trade. In the non-aligned movement, countries are represented by heads of state or government who uphold the national interests of their countries as a whole. Group of 77 meetings are held at ministerial level, and its activities are coordinated by representatives at the UN and in its agencies who are usually guided primarily by the interests of their countries’ trade and economic circles, and those interests quite often differ from the national interests. In a word, contact with the non-aligned movement enriches the position of the Group of 77 and takes its activity beyond a narrowly economic, technocratic and reformist framework.

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/41/697*, 14 October 1986, p. 313.

<sup>2</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> *UNCTAD Doc. 77/MM(V)/13*, 10 April 1983, p. 4.

However, there is also an inverse influence of the Group's approaches and views on the movement. Thus, the conciliatory attitude to foreign capital that has gained ground in the Group of 77 is also entering the movement. Non-aligned documents are adopting the method widely practised by the Group of 77 of singling out for talks a set of "urgent measures" which often are unconnected with the long-term interests of the developing countries and frequently split their united position. The concept of "true non-alignment" rests largely on the eclectic "rich North-poor South" theory still present in the Group of 77. Finally, the Group is drawing the movement into deliberate interconnection of the developing countries' external problems with internal ones, including social problems.

The NIEO programme, too, has both radical and progressive, and contradictory and inconsistent aspects. This is attributable to two principal causes: the transitional period of movement members' social and political development, and the growing differentiation in its ranks.

The NIEO undoubtedly represents the most radical and comprehensive programme for restructuring international economic relations advanced by the developing countries throughout the period of their independent existence and UN activity. There is also no doubt that this programme is part of the struggle (following the political one) for the economic decolonisation of the periphery of the capitalist economy and embodies its conflict with the imperialist centre and many significant features of the present-day national liberation movement. The programme proceeds from the axiom that there is a link between economics and politics, and includes a number of political demands reflecting protest against imperialism's most gross and high-handed behaviour in the developing world (racism, including Zionism, apartheid, aggression, use of force to keep the territory of others, sanctions, etc.). The programme makes far-reaching demands for democratisation of international relations and institutions and respect for national sovereignty, condemns neocolonial exploitation and tries to block its most odious channels. Emerging in a climate of and thanks largely to detente, the latest variants of this programme recognise the connection between detente and development and condemn militarism, including in the developing coun-

tries themselves, and its economic burden. The NIEO is like a common denominator uniting the developing countries and making their anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle a collective and organised one. It reflects the new role and place of those countries in world affairs. Finally, it is a kind of no-confidence vote in the ability of capitalist division of labour and the "free play of market forces" to overcome backwardness.

That is precisely why the NIEO programme is on the whole positively assessed in documents of the international working class and communist movement and by the socialist countries, which actively support its realisation, a fact confirmed in the declaration entitled "Peace and International Economic Cooperation" adopted at the 1984 CMEA Economic Summit.

At the same time, the NIEO programme is a peculiar kind of mirror, a reflection of the transitional period through which the developing world is presently passing, a reflection of its multi-structure economy, amorphous "ideology of development", and the differentiation in social and political orientation. Non-aligned documents, too, present the programme precisely in this way.

For all their radical formulations, these documents merely seek a *reform* of the relationship structure of the capitalist economic system, of which the bulk of non-aligned countries are a part, and the granting of preferential status for development through a series of measures that do not affect the bases of this system. The measures proposed primarily affect the relations of distribution and consumption and only insignificantly affect the relations of production and especially property relations. Of course, developing countries can achieve definite improvement in their position in the capitalist economy even by these means, but such improvements are secondary, unstable and—as events at the turn of the 1980s have shown—reversible. While insisting on reform of external economic ties, non-aligned documents do not supplement it with a programme of democratic internal transformation in the developing countries, and that is essential for carrying out the wide range of social tasks of development.

Further, even though the non-aligned movement has over 100 members, the NIEO programme is not a universal one.

It calls for a restructuring of international economic relations only between "North and South" although problems requiring restructuring exist in other areas of international trade as well. This applies, first and foremost, to "East-West" trade, for the imperialist countries have been engaging in many-sided political discrimination against socialist states.

It is in the interests of both socialist and developing states to end such discrimination. However, while regularly calling on socialist diplomacy for assistance in realising the NIEO and taking advantage of the new balance of class forces in the world, which makes it possible successfully to resist imperialist diktat, the developing countries are at times reluctant to assist the socialist countries in their struggle to protect their legitimate trade and economic interests, which are being artificially infringed on by imperialism.

Although stock phrases like "rich and poor countries" and "the rich North and the poor South" are disappearing from non-aligned documents, they still show signs of refusing to divide developed countries into socialist and imperialist ones and recognise the fundamental differences in their policy with respect to the independent states. This is all the more illogical since non-alignment itself emanates from the fact that two *opposing* social systems exist in the modern world.

Finally, as was said earlier, in the past few years the non-aligned movement has markedly evolved toward recognition of the connection between detente and development, a fact which was underestimated in the original NIEO versions. Nevertheless, the movement still has its own way of concretely interpreting this connection.

It is a reflection of the movement's socio-economic diversity that while putting forward the NIEO demands jointly, different non-aligned countries attach different meanings to them.

Specifically, for conservative regimes the NIEO is seen in two dimensions: as an additional source of enrichment (at the worst—of social manoeuvring) and as a lightning conductor in the event of failure of domestic economic and social policy (reference to the failure of talks on establishing a NIEO). For the local bourgeoisie, the NIEO is a possible means of speeding up accumulation of capital, a

political battering ram for getting into the "club of the rich". These two groups therefore regard the NIEO as a maximum programme to be carried out on the basis of an amicable deal with the monopolist bourgeoisie of the former mother countries (as was demonstrated by the bourgeois circles and theocratic upper crust of a number of OPEC countries). By contrast, the democratic and progressive regimes and broad strata of the population regard the NIEO as an instrument for strengthening the national independence and unity of the developing states and creating external conditions favouring progressive internal transformations.

Differences in levels of economic development also play a role in the movement. There are many countries which believe that an NIEO would only widen the gap between the least developed and the "new industrialising" states, the result being that they are often reluctant to support each other's demands. As the talks become more detailed, purely commercial contradictions are surfacing which could result in the most varied international combinations of coinciding or, on the contrary, opposing interests. Thus, for example, the market situation hindered the creation of effective "anti-cartels" for cotton, oil-seeds, peanuts, tropical wood, nickel, jute, sugar, tea, and hard fibres. Brazil protested against the bauxite producers' "anti-cartel", and many developing oil-importing countries make no secret of their dissatisfaction with OPEC prices.

The development of regional integration and stronger religious, ethnic and tribalist sentiments also create problems.

It comes as no surprise that all this is actively used to advantage by the enemies of the movement, both within and outside it, and especially by imperialism and its agents.

The imperialist states and their monopolies, particularly the transnationals, have sensed the threat to their positions and privileges in the developing world and have not been indifferent to the challenge to their domination on the part of the non-aligned movement and the NIEO programme. They have opposed the NIEO from the very outset in an effort to halt and reverse the process of economic decolonisation and, in the broad historical sense, the changing balance of forces in today's world, attacking the NIEO along



four principal lines: flagrant refusal to meet the developing countries' demands; emptying the programme of all content by dragging out the talks and considering it only in parts; splitting the ranks of the developing countries, including by relying on pro-imperialist regimes and the nascent local bourgeoisie, and, finally, they attempt to range the socialist community and the national liberation movement against each other.

The last two aspects of opposition to the NIEO were characteristic of all stages of the "North-South" dialogue, while the first two underwent definite evolution. The West's first reaction to the NIEO was one of confusion, which was replaced by attempts to ignore and reject it, but the active support for the NIEO by all developing countries, the energy crisis, the socialist countries' positive stance on the programme's progressive provisions, and a number of painful moral and political defeats in the UN forced it to change tactics. Liberal and reformist circles which preferred to hold talks with the Group of 77 grasped the initiative in the Western camp for some time. And though these talks aimed from the very outset to disintegrate the NIEO and replace its radical propositions with conciliatory ones, they did yield some partial results. However, with the overall intensification in the aggressiveness of imperialism's foreign policy and the economic crisis, since the end of the 1970s the West's liberal line in its dialogue with the developing countries has again been replaced by a tough and conservative one.

The obvious cause of this was the heightened international tension, reconfirming once again that there is a close connection between detente and development. As it did with the socialist countries, the West began a broad dismantling of its earlier agreements and undertakings with respect to the NIEO, a move which also reconfirmed the need to oppose such a policy in every sphere of international trade. Of significance also was the fact that the TNCs found ways to adapt to the new situation in the developing countries and began to form a broad (though unequal) "union" with the local bourgeoisie and bureaucratic elite. Finally, there was an invigoration of the processes of differentiation and local conflicts in the developing world itself, making it hard to maintain unity in the effort to realise the NIEO.

In their policy of frustrating the NIEO and opposing the

socio-economic slogans of the non-aligned movement, the imperialist states rely on both objective, technical and economic factors, and on subjective, political and diplomatic ones.

It therefore cannot be denied that the monopolies and the bourgeois state learned definite lessons from the cyclical and structural crises of the 1970s and 1980s. They began actively to restructure their economy so as to make it less material- and energy-consuming, which was the main aim of the reorientation of technical progress and state regulation. Because the epoch of colonialism and then the period of direct TNC control over the natural resources of the developing countries had in the 1950s and 1960s created in the West an economy which wasted energy and relied on cheap and abundant raw materials, the very first raw material and fuel saving measures, which merely regulated consumption, yielded substantial savings in both relative and absolute terms. For example, the energy consumption of the growth in the GNP unit in the countries of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) fell from 0.8 in 1970 to 0.5 in 1983, and oil consumption fell as low as 0.4. World oil demand went down from 65 million barrels per day in 1979 to 55 million in 1982, and in 1983 OPEC was forced to reduce its official selling prices for the first time in ten years. In general, the overall effect of the cyclical and structural crises has knocked raw material prices in real terms to the lowest level in 50 years. The raw material sellers market has again become a buyers market. The developing countries have largely lost their possibility to use fuel and raw material to pressure the West.

These circumstances have had their effects. Because of the stagnation of raw material markets, some developing countries tried to become exporters of manufactured goods. This called for massive importation of technology and created a separate branch of technological dependence on the West. What is more, while, as a rule, the young states had no competing enterprises in raw material on the markets of the consuming countries, in exporting manufactured goods they encountered the opposition of the old low-technological local industries, opposition which gave rise to protectionism. As a result, both the "raw material" and the "industrial" variants led to a substantial fall in export revenue,

which forced the developing countries to get into foreign debt. In its turn, the "credit lever" has been very actively used to influence their foreign policy, and at the turn of the 1980s the official diplomatic language of the debtor countries—both inside and outside the non-aligned movement—began markedly to contrast with their earlier statements and declarations "for internal consumption", and with the position of the movement as a whole. The food supply in many developing countries, which made food imports unavoidable, also had its impact, and this is also used as a political weapon by imperialism.

With respect to political factors, in very general terms the climate at the "North-South dialogue" changed with imperialism's transition to a whipping up of international tension. Official and business circles in the West clearly realised that the liberated countries' influence in world affairs was growing more rapidly than their nominal economic might, above all because of the change in the world balance of class forces in favour of socialism as the natural ally of the national liberation movement. For that reason, the tougher stance in relation to socialism ricocheted against the developing countries as well, especially since imperialism felt much freer to use force. As a result, the dialogue on an NIEO, which had not taken on a business-like character in the mid-1970s, entered into an impasse at the end of that decade. Western diplomacy refused even to hold talks on individual aspects of an NIEO without even bothering to explain the reason for that refusal.

Of importance was the fact that from the outset these talks had two stages, as it were. At the official, diplomatic stage, there was more or less principled discussion. At the unofficial stage—at the level of contacts between the monopolist bourgeoisie of the mother countries and the strengthening bourgeoisie of the colonies—there was more of an "intra-family" dialogue of a class of capitalists. Particularly manifest here was the attitude to the NIEO as a "maximum programme", and discussions were held beforehand on concessions by the West not only to the development but actually to the speedy growth of the local bourgeoisie. For example, it became a rule that diplomats of both groups of countries at the UN reported to their national manufacturers federations. Memoranda of the International

Chamber of Commerce began to be circulated in UN lobbies, their texts just happening to coincide, on more than a few occasions, with those of compromises reached, so much so that in the narrow secret negotiating groups they began to be quoted on a level with the position documents of the groups of countries.

The transnationals also play a role in bourgeois diplomacy. There is an obvious alliance between them and the diplomacy of their countries of origin, for which they have long been an instrument of foreign policy. Several nuances are present in the TNCs' attitude to the NIEO. On the one hand, they directly oppose the programme, which undermines their privileges in the developing world. On the other, they try to make use of some of its propositions. With their subsidiaries in the developing countries registered as "local", the TNCs at times have no objection to obtaining their share of profits from higher prices for raw materials, which they control, and from increased export of manufactured goods, which are mostly made at their enterprises. They join local manufacturers federations and lobby the UN. But all this is done with the eventual aim of working from within to give the new economic order the social content necessary to them, and turn the talks into the formulation of new "rules of the game" with the local bourgeoisie which will give it greater freedom to manoeuvre but keep it in a subordinate position, in the role of intermediary in the exploitation of the peoples of the developing countries. It was at these bourgeois and pro-bourgeois circles that the West directed its propaganda on the eve of the Delhi summit.

Western diplomacy still uses the theory of "interdependence", which has been revived in the 1980s with an orientation toward the Group of 77, to justify the West's refusal to meet the demands of the developing countries. To the old thesis that, with the existing close economic relations between nations, any radical reform of international trade could disorganise it and harm the economy of all participating countries has been added the thesis that it is necessary to "share the burden" of a way out of the crisis since the economies of the West and the developing countries are "interdependent". All this ignores the fact that the crisis itself started in the imperialist centres and the developing countries became involuntary victims. It is also ignored that

if their economy is actually in danger of being disorganised, the reason for it is the preservation rather than the breaking of the old orders in the international capitalist division of labour. Thus, even on a purely commercial, technical and economic level, the "mutuality" of the dependence of developed capitalist and developing countries on each other differs qualitatively and on balance obviously does not favour the emerged countries. If one takes their relations as a whole, with account of the export of capital, transfer of technology, debts, social relations, etc., that dependence will be seen to be a result of the system itself, oppressive one for the developing states.

Western opposition to individual aspects of the NIEO is as follows.

Western countries want international commodity agreements only on individual types of raw materials rather than on an "integrated raw material programme". They take increased processing at the site of extraction to mean transfer to developing countries of some "lower stages" of manufacture, but only by decision of the TNCs, which must be accorded a "favourable investment climate". The result has been that the raw material markets remain unstabilised.

With respect to *manufactured goods*, the West is prepared to maintain their preferential status but only in the volume and types which do not "upset the market" of the importer countries, i.e. do not offer dangerous competition to their own industry. Furthermore, contrary to earlier undertakings, the West insists on "grading" these preferentials depending on the level of economic development of the country from which goods come, i.e. insists on selectivity, with all the ensuing possibilities for exerting political pressure on those countries. The result is that the overall preferential system is being narrowed and industrialisation of the developing countries is slowing down.

Using the state budget deficits as an excuse, the Western countries refuse even to give an approximate date when their official *development aid* will reach the level recommended by the UN (0.7% of GNP). Instead, they propose to compensate for this by increasing private investment in the developing countries, the least developed of which are in a particularly difficult situation. In 1981 a special UN conference recommended that official aid to them should not be

less than 0.15% of the GNP of donor states, but this aid has actually dropped from 0.2% in 1965 to 0.13% in 1970 and 0.07% in 1981.<sup>1</sup> The West stubbornly opposes greater compensatory financing, reform of the IMF and the World Bank, and the very idea of a new monetary conference, the result being that the balance of payments deficits and indebtedness of the developing countries are growing, and the least developed of them are turning into "unhooked wagons" of development.

Caught in these difficult financial conditions, some groups of debtor countries, for example in Latin America, have been demanding that the easing of the debt burden and debt rescheduling should be the subject of collective inter-government talks between developed capitalist and developing countries, and calling for a "debtors cartel" to press for more favourable repayment terms at such talks. The "cartel" idea would give debtor countries the right, under particular aggravated circumstances, to halt repayments or make only partial ones, but the Western powers activity, backed by the IMF, insist that private debts should only be discussed at talks between individual debtor countries and banking consortiums, and threaten potential participants in the "debtor cartel" with a halt to current financing or tougher terms.

At the talks on a code of conduct for transnationals, the West has been demanding that this document should contain "parallel commitments" by companies and governments, although legally they fall under different categories of law. In the sphere of technology they insist on minimum regulation and on a purely recommendatory character for the UN "code". With respect to navigation, Western diplomacy has been preventing the UN from discussing the question of the "convenient flags" under which the transnationals register their fleets, including transport and oil fleets.

"Limited forward movement in certain fields has been offset by subsequent retrogression in those fields and by regression in other fields," said the Delhi summit on the results of the ten-year "North-South" dialogue. "As a result, there has been hardly any progress towards the establishment of the New International Economic Order."<sup>2</sup> There

<sup>1</sup> IBRD, Op. cit., p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> UN Document A/38/132, 8 April 1983, p. 70.

have been varied reactions in the movement to these results, some members giving in to pessimism, but one common reaction to the West's obstructionist course has been a desire to continue the struggle and maintain unity, which was a result again achieved at the seventh conference. Specifically, further efforts to effect a NIEO are to develop in three interconnected directions: a demarche with respect to the West on behalf of the movement as a whole; global talks; and strengthening of the developing countries' position by implementing a programme for their "collective self-reliance".

A demarche on behalf of the movement is a relatively new phenomenon for the movement. Previously, the country convening the regular conference simply distributed its documents through diplomatic channels to the governments of the world's largest states, but the decisions and documents of the seventh conference were distributed in a different way. Special emissaries were sent to the six leading Western countries to persuade them to start global talks. It was decided to lobby the Big Seven meeting in Williamsburg and to use the 38th UN General Assembly session for an unofficial exchange of opinions on the course of the "North-South" dialogue.

New in form, these initiatives came up against a blank wall of Western opposition. In Washington and London the movement's envoys were given a decidedly cold welcome. Reagan refused to receive them any at all, and Margaret Thatcher merely promised to consult with the allies. However, it is important that the movement no longer operates only through the Group of 77 but also directly. Incidentally, the Delhi summit also reached agreement on division of labour and cooperation between the movement and the Group in the struggle for a new international economic order.

The developing countries consider the global talks to be very important in this struggle. These would be complex talks organised within the UN framework on the principal aspects of the NIEO at a fairly high level of representation and with two interconnected objectives: to prevent disintegration of the NIEO programme by Western diplomacy, and take the talks out of the impasse which they entered at the turn of the 1980s. It is proposed that these talks should be simultaneous, consistent, interrelated and directed at the

adoption of real measures covering the problems of raw materials, energy, trade, economic development and finances, but it is precisely in this area that the West's sabotage of development needs has been most manifest.

Resolution 34/138 on the appropriateness of such talks was passed by consensus at the 34th General Assembly session, while the 35th session agreed on almost 90% of the agenda. The 1981 Cancun "North-South" meeting and the 1982 Versailles meeting of the Big Seven both favoured a start to those talks, and the developing countries submitted compromise formulations of controversial points to the 36th and 37th Assembly sessions. However, the question of a start to the global talks is still outstanding and it is quite unclear what has become of them for while the Scandinavian and Mediterranean states, Canada, Australia and New Zealand agree that the talks should begin, the US, secretly backed by the FRG, Britain and Japan, resolutely opposes them. Chairman of the Group of 77, has noted that the global talks have been stymied mainly by the refusal of several industrialised countries, including a major industrial country, to recognise the economic and political necessity for such talks.

These circumstances merely heighten the developing countries' interest in the programme of collective self-reliance, which calls for maximum development of mutual trade and economic, and scientific and technical cooperation so as to reduce dependence on the imperialist centres and lay a material base under their collective diplomacy. Because of the impasse at the UN talks on a NIEO, the developing countries have decided to try to set up a kind of "mini-NIEO" for themselves.

The non-aligned movement enthusiastically included this idea in its Havana, Delhi and Harare declarations. The Buenos Aires and Caracas action programmes were worked out jointly with the Group of 77 on the basis of its 1979 Arusha Declaration. In brief, it calls for a preferential regime in trade between developing countries, expansion of the regional development banks and a solidarity fund of non-aligned countries for economic and social development, regional centres for developing and transferring technology and a common centre for the movement in Delhi, an information centre on TNCs in Havana, a Council



of Associations of Developing Countries Producers-Exporters of Raw Materials, cooperation in education, use of personnel, transport, insurance, and credit, multi-lateral projects, etc.

Certainly, there are many difficulties in the way of this programme. For example, the question of how it will assure the interests of the least developed countries remains unresolved. On the whole, it is a fairly complicated endeavour to merge the programme with the regional integrational associations, and in a sense the programme even gives broad scope for TNC activity. The main thing, however, is that it is encountering the process of differentiation in the developing world, local conflicts, and the resistance of Western countries, which continue to attempt to interfere in its elaboration. For that reason it is hardly likely that this programme will be realised in full. But neither is it an empty slogan, for the first practical successes have already been scored in this area.

Thus, OPEC's share in official development aid rose from 5% in 1970 to 29% in 1975 and 20.6% in 1981, the actual amounts being \$1.01, \$8.93 and \$7.52 billion respectively, or 1.18%, 2.9% and 1.4% of GNP. Eight major clearing systems covering trade between 56 developing countries, and five major mutual commercial credit systems are in operation. Plans are going ahead for establishing a "bank for the South" and an insurance system for export credits for developing countries, and the system of mutual trade preferentials mentioned earlier. A State Enterprises Centre has been organised to exchange experience. The share of the developing countries' mutual trade in their total trade rose from 19.8% in 1970 to 23.2% in 1980, and it is expected that by 1990 this share will again increase substantially, reducing those countries' dependence on the imperialist states to roughly half of their foreign trade. In other words, the collective self-reliance is already working, and on the whole in the direction of economic decolonisation.

As is only to be expected, the non-aligned movement's socio-economic activity and its efforts to establish a new international economic order are constantly borne in mind by socialist policy and diplomacy. The socialist states invariably support the progressive propositions of the NIEO and non-aligned documents, regard the movement's activity

as a part of the struggle to restructure international economic relations on a universal basis, and welcome the independent countries' greater role in world affairs.

That is why imperialism—both directly and through its agents—has been trying to divide world socialism and the national liberation movement, making use of inconsistencies in non-aligned programmes and the heterogeneity of the movement. For example, just before the Delhi conference, Singapore's Foreign Affairs Ministry circulated a document attacking the decisions of the Havana conference, the USSR, Cuba and Vietnam. The "absolute non-alignment" slogan is gaining common currency again, a slogan which is actually the same as the harmful concept of "rich North and poor South".

However, life itself is exposing all these attacks. It is enough, for example, to compare the positions of the West and the socialist countries on the NIEO for it to become clear that there is no basis for placing them in the same category. The CMEA Declaration "Peace and International Economic Cooperation", says that "the CMEA members support the developing states' progressive demands in the struggle for economic decolonisation, complete sovereignty over their natural and other resources, and their economic activity, for broad and equal participation in the resolution of international economic problems, an end to the outflow of capital and skilled personnel, and unconditional application of a general preferential system, with a view to preventing a deterioration in the developing countries' economic situation and facilitating their progress... They want an early start to global talks within the UN framework." Regarding economic aid, the CMEA members back the developing countries' demands on the imperialist states and "shall continue to render, as far as possible, economic and technical assistance to the states that have achieved freedom and independence in their efforts to develop the national economy."<sup>1</sup> The 1984 CMEA summit expressed its solidarity with the decisions and message of the seventh non-aligned conference, and welcomed the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist activity which the movement had conducted following its sixth conference. On a Soviet initiative and supported by

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 16 June 1984.

non-aligned countries, the 40th UN General Assembly session passed a resolution on "International Economic Security". The Soviet Union reiterated its unequivocal support for a new international economic order in its memorandum entitled "International Economic Security—an Essential Condition for Improving International Economic Relations", which states that such security implies renunciation of forcible methods, protection of states' legitimate rights and interests, and reliable guarantees that those rights and interests will not be infringed. The 27th CPSU Congress noted that a new international economic order would ensure equal economic security for all states.

Today it is clear that, despite all the difficulties, the process of restructuring international economic relations on fair and democratic bases is irreversible. And progress in this area will be all the greater, the closer the cooperation between the non-aligned movement and world socialism.

## **Non-Aligned Countries Against Racism and Racial Discrimination**

Non-aligned states' active participation in the struggle against racial discrimination is a clear manifestation of the movement's anti-imperialist essence. Following the achievement of independence, far from subsiding, the struggle against neo-colonialism and racism has been intensifying. In this area non-aligned states demonstrate their solidarity and vital interest in a just solution to world problems.

Non-aligned states have been waging the anti-racial struggle in several directions: political, moral and legal condemnation of racism; struggle against racism internationally; and measures to eliminate racial contradictions and prevent racial discrimination in their own countries.

The participation of the peoples of non-aligned states in the anti-racial movement is only natural for racism arose on the basis of their age-long enemy—colonialism, which needed racism and racial theories to justify the domination of the mother countries and also to split oppressed nations and peoples and win some peoples over to its side as a support for colonial domination and set them against other peoples. The colonialists always claimed that “natives” were incapable of self-government, that if they were granted independence anarchy and chaos would result in their countries. It was drummed into the oppressed peoples that they were “the white man's burden”, the aim being perpetually to postpone the granting of independence to the colonies. Even in the 1950s, the West and the colonies themselves were convinced that independence could not be granted for at least 100-150 years.

Racial discrimination took a particularly cynical form in those countries where colonial rule was maintained with the help of local privileged ethnic groups or immigrants. In Kenya and Rhodesia, where there were groups of white

settlers numbering a few hundred thousand, these groups enjoyed considerable privileges: they owned the best land, only they had the right to govern the territory, and they were also in charge of production. A White Paper presented to the British parliament in 1960 entitled "Historical Survey of the Origins and Growth of the Mau Mau" noted that the mainspring of the anti-colonial rebellion in Kenya was the unjust system of land tenure, which, along with the other forms of discrimination (the different wage scales which were applied to Europeans and Africans, the restrictive covenants which applied to housing in European areas, the restriction on the planting of cash crops such as coffee, etc.) caused a deep sense of resentment.

Following the liquidation of colonialism, in some countries racial discrimination, far from disappearing, became even more brutal. The situation in South Africa is especially alarming. Direct US support for the Pretoria racists worsens the position of the local population and diminishes the results of its struggle. Discrimination against the 28 million-strong Black population of South Africa on the part of the white minority has intensified. The reforms carried out by the racists in the last few years, for example voting rights for the "coloured" and Indian population (but not for the Africans) and the creation of autonomous administrative units—bantustans—for the African population, aim to split the united front of "coloured", Indians and Africans and weaken the liberation movement. The nine million indigenous Africans living in the four "bantustans" already declared "independent" have lost South African citizenship while acquiring no other. The bantustans (which are being enforced against the people's will) violate other rights of the population, including the right to self-determination. Bantustan residents' economic situation has also deteriorated, as evidenced by the mere fact that unemployment stands at 20-25%. "Apartheid as an institutionalized form of racism," said the Report of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (Geneva, 1-12 August 1983), "is a deliberate and totally abhorrent affront to the conscience and dignity of mankind, a crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security."

Such a policy undermines peace not only in South Afri-

ca but throughout the continent and throughout the world. Defending regimes which history has condemned to destruction, South Africa's racist rulers have for two decades been waging criminal wars against the peoples of the frontline states (Angola, Mozambique and others), terrorising the anti-racist regime in Lesotho, and trying to topple the progressive governments in the Seychelles and other countries. All this shows that South Africa is operating as a gendarme in Africa.

The US and other NATO states support the South African racists because of the selfish interests of those states' ruling classes. Moreover, in an effort to continue exploiting the peoples of the young countries, they encourage the immigration of foreign workers and pursue a policy with respect to them which engenders racial discrimination. Racism is a phenomenon characteristic of the whole system of capitalism. Here are some examples.

In the United States, where there has been a sharp rise in the number of Latin American and Asian immigrants, almost 50 million members of national minorities continue to be subjected to discrimination. Of course, in the 1960s the difficult struggle, at times taking the form of rebellion, waged by Afro-Americans and immigrants from developing countries resulted in recognition of formal equality, an improvement in their situation, and a lessening of racial sentiments among the white population. This is apparent to anyone who has been able to visit the US in the early 1970s and at the present time, but the socio-economic system of national oppression that remains intact has continued to reproduce discrimination, especially under the Reagan Administration. For example, discrimination in the army is illegal but nevertheless a reality: Blacks receive twice as many duty details and difficult tasks than whites but stand a third of the latter's chance of being promoted to officer rank. Black families' incomes are almost 50% less than those of whites, and Black unemployment is twice that of whites. According to Congressman Charles Hayes, poverty is the lot of every third Black. This state of affairs is naturally of concern to the non-aligned African states.

In an effort to hide the fact of discrimination against tens of millions of people in its own country, the US administration has been stubbornly refusing to accede to the In-

ternational Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the international covenants on human rights, and other anti-racist international agreements. Yet it is well known that it is precisely Washington's support for apartheid and Zionism and the fostering of discrimination at home that is the principal obstacle to elimination of racism.

In recent decades non-aligned states have been given one more ground for actively opposing racial discrimination: tens of millions of their citizens live and work in developed capitalist states. There are 1.6 million Turks and a total of 4.5 million foreign workers (7.5% of the population) in the FRG; in France—4.2 million foreign workers (about 8% of the population), of which 1.2 million are Algerians; in Great Britain—over two million Indians, Pakistanis and others (4% of the population), and so on. Approximately 15 million foreign workers live in Western Europe alone.

In developed capitalist countries these people are the victims of gross and varied discrimination. They are paid less for the same work than citizens of the country. These people are given the hardest and dirtiest work and are the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

In the West foreign workers in general have very limited rights, but among them are real outcasts. These are those who have come to the country illegally, and they number many millions. Bourgeois states deliberately encourage illegal immigration so that they can exploit those workers even more mercilessly, for people who have no documents and are constantly threatened with deportation will agree to work for even the most meagre pay. They are naturally not trade union members and cannot effectively defend their rights. That is why the ruthless capitalists want them in the country. Of course, all this is touted as "free migration", "freedom of entry and exit", etc.

Non-aligned states, which sometimes need to have their citizens work and send even small sums to support their families, are naturally anxious that these people should not be the victims of discrimination. And there is another aspect to the problem. The governments of the independent states cannot afford to have their citizens deported in bulk since this would create complex problems for their still weak economies. These are the additional factors that impel non-

aligned states to combat racism.

As far back as 1955, the Afro-Asian states assembled in Bandung pointed to the link between colonialism and racism, stating that "colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end" and declaring racism illegal. "The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation",<sup>1</sup> said the conference's final communique.

In its 1961 Belgrade Declaration the movement states that "the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constitutes a grave violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights",<sup>2</sup> thus pointing out that racism is illegal and on that basis vehemently condemning and demanding an immediate end to South African apartheid. One aim of the movement, said the declaration of the 1970 third conference in Lusaka, is "the fight against colonialism and racism which are a negation of human equality and dignity".

When a sizable group of African states joined the non-aligned movement and "Africanised" it to a certain extent, the movement as a whole began more vigorously to oppose racism and racial discrimination. "Africa," the fifth summit noted in 1976, "gave a firm anti-colonial and anti-racist content to the Movement."<sup>3</sup>

Movement documents thoroughly demonstrate that racism, and in particular its most repulsive manifestation—apartheid, are illegal. The declaration of the fourth conference (1973) on the national liberation struggle says that apartheid "is more than a system of racial discrimination: it is primarily a form of colonialism based on the fascist oppression of a people by a minority of foreign colonists; an oppression that exploits the people and deprives them of their basic rights, scorning the most elementary human values."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Non-Aligned Conferences: Basic Documents, 1961-1975*, Compiled and Published by Bandaranaike Centre for International Studies, Colombo, pp. III, IV.

<sup>2</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 191.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.



It is to the credit of non-aligned states that they have promoted new legal institutions to defend the peoples fighting against colonialism and racism, institutions such as the 1964 international recognition of national liberation movements as the sole legitimate representatives of their peoples. Guided by these decisions, the OAU and the UN have officially recognised such movements as SWAPO (Namibia), the African National Congress of South Africa, the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, and others. International recognition has enabled these movements to obtain aid and successfully combat breakaway movements, has raised their authority in negotiations, etc.

Of great importance also is firm non-aligned support for the right of the oppressed peoples to employ armed struggle against racism and colonialism. Thus, in 1970 in Lusaka the movement called on all countries to extend their moral and material assistance to the South African people's struggle for human rights and fundamental freedoms, while the 1972 Foreign Ministers Conference declared that the peoples have a legitimate right to use armed struggle and that only armed struggle can put an end to colonial and racial domination in South Africa.

The fourth non-aligned summit adopted a special document entitled "Declaration on the Struggle for National Liberation" which contained the following programme of measures to assist the liberation movements, including anti-racist organisations: create a fund to support and strengthen the effectiveness of the struggles of national liberation movement; open bureaux of national parties and movements in the capitals of non-aligned countries; and mobilise the public in non-aligned countries to support the fighting peoples.<sup>1</sup>

The stance taken by non-aligned states helped to make anti-racist moral and political principles legal norms. Under the influence of the international practice of socialist and non-aligned states, the principle of aiding the peoples fighting for their liberation has become an established one in present-day international relations. The content and volume of this aid varies according to the internal or international character and objectives of the movement.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 110.

The national liberation movements against colonialism and racism are international in character and have the right to receive virtually any assistance, including weapons, and states have the full right to render such assistance.

The 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law says that in their actions against, and resistance to such forcible action (on the part of an Administering Power—*Author.*) in pursuit of the exercise of their right to self-determination, the peoples are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. The Definition of Aggression adopted by common consent at the UN says specifically: peoples that have been forcibly denied the possibility to realise the principle of self-determination have the right “to seek and receive support” to further their liberation struggle; and the rendering to them of such support and assistance in keeping with the norms of international law cannot be regarded as an act of aggression.<sup>1</sup>

The anti-racial movements in non-racist states are not international ones, but modern international law sanctions aid to such movements primarily in the form of moral and political support and defence of their rights via their own states. It calls on all states to sign international conventions on protection against racial discrimination. These conventions are supervised by a community of states.

In 1973, on the basis of norms elaborated with the participation of non-aligned countries, the UN drew up a Programme for the First United Nations Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held in Geneva in 1983, summed up the results of the first Decade and outlined a programme for the second.

The number of states that acceded to the international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination rose from 75 in 1973 to 122 in 1984, and other anti-racist documents such as the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women have come into effect. All this confirmed that racism has been made

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1974*, Vol. 28. Office of Public Information, United Nations, New York, 1977, p. 849.

illegal and strengthened the international climate of intolerance toward this shameful phenomenon. It was also proved conclusively that, with the exception of gross violations such as genocide and apartheid, human rights can be successfully defended through international cooperation without interfering in states' internal affairs.

The measures taken internationally under the Decade Programme invigorated the efforts of most states to eradicate racism.

Moral, political and legal condemnation of racism enabled non-aligned states to agree their viewpoints, elaborate common positions in the struggle against this evil and get effective measures adopted at the UN and internationally.

Even before the September 1979 Havana conference, a meeting of the movement's Coordinating Bureau in Maputo decided to set up a special fund to finance SWAPO's growing needs in the struggle against the racist Pretoria regime. A programme was drawn up for eradicating racism in Africa and a resolution passed on admitting the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front—Zimbabwe being another country that was combating racism—as a full and equal member of the non-aligned movement.

These decisions greatly enhanced the international authority of the anti-racist liberation movements of Zimbabwe and Namibia. The active support of almost 100 states undoubtedly created the favourable international conditions for the talks between the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front and Britain, which eventually led to the liquidation of the racist regime in Zimbabwe and national independence for that country.

With respect to the action programme, it called for more vigorous armed struggle against the racist regime, and effective coordination between the OAU Emergency Fund for Namibia and the similar fund set up by non-aligned states.<sup>1</sup> The programme urged the UN Council for Namibia and the UN Special Committee Against Apartheid to cooperate with the OAU Committee for Sanctions so as to take the following urgent measures: a) compile a list of all banks and multinational corporations which still cooperate with

<sup>1</sup> *El-Moujahid*, 20 April 1981.

South Africa while having interests in member countries; b) refuse the participation in the development projects to the states maintaining economic relations with South Africa; c) set a time-table for breaking all relations with South Africa and publish a list of the countries which break this resolution so that cardinal sanctions may be taken against them.<sup>1</sup>

The OAU established a coordinating committee, later called the Liberation Committee, to render direct and many-sided aid to the national liberation movements, including the anti-racist movements. The creation and open functioning of this Committee were made possible by the establishment in international organisations of principles outlawing colonialism and racism and making any assistance to the peoples fighting for their liberation not only a right but also a duty of states. Not all the decisions taken by non-aligned countries were implemented or implemented in good time. For example, it took several years for the aid fund for liberation movements to be set up, and the idea of sanctions against imperialist states was never realised, though not through the fault of the non-aligned members. The support and solidarity fund began functioning only following the fifth non-aligned forum in Colombo.

The OAU, too, has not always taken correct decisions on the struggle against colonialism and racism. Thus, the 24th session of the OAU Ministerial Council (Addis Ababa, January 1975) recognised splinter organisations which were cooperating with the South African racists and were their puppets (FNLA and UNITA). Only later, beginning with the 26th session of the Liberation Committee, did the OAU gradually change its line on the Angolan question and refuse to recognise the separatist organisations and start to recognise the legitimate government of the People's Republic of Angola.

Non-aligned states combat racism at the UN as well. It was at their suggestion that the 24th General Assembly session decided not to recognise the South African delegate.

The early 1980s saw a considerable intensification of the struggle of the people of South Africa against apartheid. The ANC's military organisation—Umkonto we sizwe—increased

<sup>1</sup> *El Moujahid*, 20 April 1981.

the scale of its partisan operations, setting off explosions at power stations, on railway lines, at oil reservoirs, etc., between 1981 and 1983. Armed attacks were also carried out against police stations and military installations. There was a noticeable increase in the influence of the African National Congress and its ally, the South African Communist Party. Legal organisations opposing apartheid or particular manifestations of it in one form or another also became more active. The entire country has been periodically engulfed by mass political campaigns against the apartheid regime.

It is likely that, despite the resistance of the imperialist-backed racists, the problem of liquidating the colonial regime in Namibia and other small African territories will soon be resolved, but the anti-apartheid struggle is obviously going to be a more complicated and protracted one because that regime relies on the support not only of the imperialist states but also of the local white population. Faced with this situation, the progressive organisations of South Africa have been trying to widen the split in the ranks of the white population and win workers and other strata of the working people to the side of the just anti-apartheid struggle.

The Action Programme for the Second Decade sets out the future tasks of the anti-racist struggle, the most immediate ones being to liberate Namibia and liquidate the apartheid regime in South Africa. The Programme calls above all for broader international aid and support for the Namibian and South African liberation movements and the frontline states, which are a new and very effective force in the anti-apartheid struggle, render much-needed assistance to the liberation movements, and defend the whole of Africa from the racists, sometimes at very great cost. That is why the racists and their protectors direct their main blows against those states. The Action Programme regards as contrary to international law the claim that the liberation movements and the states which help them are "terrorist", and affirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements to eradicate apartheid using all available means, including armed struggle, and the special responsibility of the UN and the international community for providing moral, political and material assistance.

The Nkomati Accord between Mozambique and South Africa, and the agreement between Angola and South Africa on "separation", which calls for a pullout of South African troops from southern Angola do not mean that other states do not have the right to render any assistance to the national liberation movements of southern Africa in their just struggle. All states still have this right, which stems from the basic principles of inter-state relations. Indeed, it is the duty of the community of states to expand all-round support to the anti-racist movements.

This position was reaffirmed in the final declaration of the frontline summit held on 29 April 1984 in Arusha (Tanzania) and attended by Tanzania, Angola, Mozambique, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and also by representatives of the ANC and SWAPO. The meeting reiterated its loyalty to the struggle for the complete liberation of Namibia and expressed full support for Mozambique and Angola in their effort to liquidate the armed bands on their territories. It also backed Mozambique's decision to give political, moral and diplomatic support to the ANC in its struggle against apartheid and for majority rule in South Africa. While expressing confidence that the peoples of South Africa will continue the liberation struggle using all means, including armed struggle, the final document expressed the hope that South Africa would fulfill its undertaking to withdraw its troops from Angola and halt actions aimed to destabilise Mozambique.

Demands made with respect to South Africa include those that all states should strictly abide by the Security Council decisions, among them Resolution 418 (1977) on an arms embargo against that country, that the Security Council should introduce and enforce mandatory sanctions against the regime under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, and that all relations with the apartheid regime should be severed.

The Geneva meeting also advanced a broad political, educational, and legal programme to eradicate or prevent racial discrimination in all other states, although, in our view, more attention should have been paid to this question and to socio-economic transformations. The programme urges states that are not party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and

other anti-racist international agreements to join and strictly abide by them. These agreements contain a balanced programme of measures, including economic and social ones, which could make states' efforts more effective.

In spite of the fact that there are contradictions between non-aligned members on the anti-racial struggle, the struggle itself helps to unite the movement and strengthen its alliance with socialist states.

This was most vividly demonstrated at the Harare summit, which set up an action fund to combat intervention, colonialism and apartheid. A special conference statement on southern Africa reiterated the movement's "commitment to the eradication of the evil system of apartheid" and stated that "the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, remains the only peaceful option to compel the racist Pretoria regime to abandon apartheid."<sup>1</sup> As non-aligned Chairman-Coordinator Robert Mugabe said at that conference: "What is needed now is action: action to eradicate the evil system of apartheid."<sup>2</sup>

The consistent struggle against racism and racial discrimination shows that the non-aligned movement is united not only by socio-economic factors but also by socio-political ones. The struggle against racial discrimination is going to heighten because the enormous disproportion in economic development causes great unemployment in the developing countries, at the same time that there is increased exploitation of foreign workers from the developing countries in the developed capitalist states. Notwithstanding the rise in unemployment in the West, the number of foreign workers will continue to grow. The mass of foreign workers that are a minority discriminated against in the countries of developed capitalism need to be defended, and this can be done most effectively through the pooled efforts of the entire community of developing countries. That is why the non-aligned movement will be paying increasing attention to defending national minorities and combating racial discrimination in all its manifestations.

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/41/697*, 14 October 1986, pp. 146, 147.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 316.

As was said earlier, another long-term task will be the fight against racism in Africa, which is why the developing countries will have to tackle this problem for a long time to come. Action against racism and racial discrimination enhance the prestige of the non-aligned movement and its international significance.

The struggle against racism and apartheid has always been supported in the USSR. Putting forward the bases for a comprehensive international security system, the 27th CPSU Congress declared that one of its essential elements must be "eradication of genocide, apartheid, the preaching of fascism and all other racial, national or religious discrimination, and discrimination against people on that basis".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mikhail Gorbachev, *Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1986, p. 93.



**The Non-Aligned Movement Against  
“Information Imperialism”**

In recent years the term “information imperialism” has become increasingly current in the international lexicon. It came into vogue after it was first used in 1973 by ex-president of Finland Urho Kekkonen, who spoke of the monopolisation of the mass media in the hands of a few countries and giant corporations that impose their views on other peoples and interfere in their intellectual life.

Since then there has been heated discussion of this subject at many international forums, including the UN, UNESCO and especially in the non-aligned movement, the latter, for objective reasons, gradually becoming the principal initiator of worldwide consideration of the issue.

At international meetings, Western countries usually oppose the very concept of “information imperialism”, but it is a timely concept, for imperialism is an unprecedented concentration of production and capital. In the non-socialist world there is growing monopolisation of the capitalist information market in the hands of a few powerful concerns. The merger of banking and industrial capital typical of imperialism is manifested here in the formation of powerful financial-industrial-information (publishing) groupings and the absorption of information companies by giant industrial corporations and banks. What we have here is a feature of imperialism—the export of capital along with the export of commodities; Western information monopolies export their communication equipment and propaganda to the developing countries and at the same time seek to lay their hands (openly or often in a disguised manner) on publishing houses, radio and television stations, and other information media. Another objective manifestation of imperialism is the formation of powerful transnational corporations in the communication sphere: literally scores of transnationals

now have unlimited sway in the production and sale of electronic equipment for radio, TV and the press, communication satellites, computers, etc. Division of the world into spheres of influence is another feature of imperialism evident in the mass media: the largest American, British and French imperialist telegraph agencies and their radio and TV corporations have their own zones in the world.

As state monopoly capitalism, imperialism is characterised by the interweaving of interests and functions of state leadership and private monopolies. Both state and private mass media operate in a single direction on the most important questions—to brainwash the masses to suit imperialism.

The bourgeois state has taken it on itself to set up a special government apparatus for foreign policy propaganda which supplements (and in many instances even directs) the external propaganda activity of private information and propaganda agencies. A state monopoly apparatus for foreign policy propaganda has actually been formed in the West in the last few decades.

In general, “information imperialism” is a special form of struggle against the revolutionary and progressive forces of today, world socialism and the peoples’ national liberation, a struggle being waged with the broad use of ideology, propaganda and mass media.

The main victims of “information imperialism” are the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which colonialism has left with extremely underdeveloped mass media. Such a state of them has been artificially maintained and supported by the West for decades.

With the bulk of the world’s population, the developing countries account for less than 20% of the total circulation of the daily newspapers published. Nine African countries publish no daily newspapers at all and ten Asian countries have an average of under 100 copies of daily newspapers for every 1,000 persons, while in ten other Asian countries there are less than 20 copies per 1,000.

The late establishment of a national press in most developing countries, the high level of illiteracy, the multilingual character of those countries, the lack of printing equipment, the high cost of imported paper, poor telecommunication equipment and the absence of means of communication in

the vast rural areas all hinder the development of a mass press in the young states.

The situation is no better with regard to other information media. According to UNESCO, Asia, Africa and Latin America account for only about a quarter of the world's radio stations and 7% of TV stations, about 20% of books published (by number of titles), and less than 18% of cinemas. About 30 developing states have no information agencies. In Africa there is one television for 400-500 inhabitants. While in the early 1980s the developed countries had over 800 radios for every 1,000 persons, in the developing countries the figure was less than 100.

Overall, the developing countries have ten times less newspapers (by circulation), eight times less radios and fifteen times less television sets per head than the developed countries. In 40 countries a maximum of 8% of the population is able to read the newspapers, while in 60 countries a half of the population does not have radios. In Latin America two agencies from the USA—AP and UP—provide two-thirds of the international information published in the region's newspapers. According to the UN, 80% of the press reports and radio programmes of Asia (excluding Japan and China), Africa and Latin America come from New York, London and Paris, but only an insignificant percentage of the information received by Western telegraph agencies from those continents are distributed further or reach the press.

Evidence of the unwillingness of the imperialist propaganda media to give sufficiently broad and objective publicity to events in Asia, Africa and Latin America (and of their parallel attempts to flood those continents with the information to their liking) has been supplied by Sean MacBride, Chairman of the UNESCO International Commission for the Study of Communication, who pointed out that the permanently accredited correspondents of the largest telegraph agencies are distributed as follows: 34% in North America, 28% in Europe, 17% in Asia and Oceania, 11% in Latin America, 6% in the Middle East, and only 4% in Africa.

Not having their own correspondent network abroad or modern means of communication, most information agencies of Asian, African and Latin American states are forced to rely mainly on the monopolies of the leading imperialist powers for information. Only a few national agencies of

developing countries (Tunisia, Egypt, Sudan, Iran, Libya and Zaire) have the technical means to make rapid radio or telex reports, while many other agencies exchange information by post.

At the same time, the capitals of most developing countries are connected with the former mother countries and the headquarters of American agencies by the most modern means of communication belonging to UP, AP, Reuter and France Press. Information from the developing countries is not simply broadcast but is carefully sifted and brought in line with the objectives of the Western press agencies.

The developing countries' lack of correspondents abroad, their weak technical base and their dependence on Western agencies and information sources in general enables the imperialist powers to carry out broad ideological expansion in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

A main channel for imperialism's ideological expansion internationally is the export of television programmes. The USA is the chief exporter of TV programmes (up to 200,000 hours annually), far outstripping the British (30,000 hours) and the French (20,000 hours). Each of the American commercial television giants such as CBS and NBC does business with over 100 countries, the overwhelming majority of them developing countries. Washington regards television as the most effective means of creating an American "image" abroad and imposing Western views and ideas on the developing countries.

The developing countries have almost no possibility to export their own TV programmes. They have neither video tapes nor the possibility to broadcast via satellite.

It is considerably cheaper to obtain TV programmes and films from the USA, for example, than to organise to produce them in a developing country. In the mid-1970s, a half-hour American TV programme, which could cost up to \$ 200,000 to produce, could be hired in Costa Rica for \$ 60-70 or shown in Kenya for \$ 25-30.

"Information imperialism" is also clearly evident in cinematography, where there is a huge disproportion between capitalist and developing countries in the number of cinemas and cinema seats, and above all in the matter of whose films are shown on the screen. The international flow of films is largely regulated by the commercial and ideological

interests of the largest Western cinema corporations. The leading film exporter is the USA, whose films take up no less than 50% of screen time outside the socialist countries, while Indian or Japanese films, which are produced in great quantities, are not widely distributed outside those countries.

The easy availability of Western films and TV programmes has a social and moral cost for the developing world.

Mass culture materials exert an even greater influence on the average person in the developing countries than political information. Cinema and television are very effective means of propaganda when information is presented in an entertaining way. Visual information has the exceptional ability to influence the illiterate strata of the population.

The values and ideas of the consumer society touted in Western informational, advertising and entertainment programmes contradict the basic interests and goals of the developing countries. Such information is not only contrary to the traditional forms of life and cultural identity but also provokes even more serious conflicts between poverty and wealth, between requirements and possibilities, and widens the social division. At a time when the developing countries should be mustering all their resources so as to follow an effective national policy, the Western media offer programmes designed to increase consumption of Western goods and encourage individualism and consumption oriented attitude.

An ever increasing number of experts from developing countries has been dealing with the subject of "information imperialism" and assessing its causes and effects. One book by Indian authors points out that the discrepancies in the communication and information flow are a side product of colonialism, and while colonialism has been ended, these discrepancies remain, their objective being to perpetuate the developing countries' cultural subordination to new forms of neocolonial culture. The book states that the developing countries need to press for a restructuring of the world information order, otherwise it will be difficult to effect a new economic order and provide a better life for people in the developing countries.

Many foreign researchers draw attention to the fact that the ideological domination that is preserved by this disproportion is meant to ensure imperialism's economic domina-

tion in Asia, Africa and Latin America and guarantee many millions of dollars in profit to Western, and above all American, corporations. Control over the national information systems of the developing countries is vital for Western business. The global expansion of US capital would encounter appreciable difficulties without the conditions for spreading their information and ideology, without the possibility to manipulate the multi-million audience abroad, and without the advertisement of American commodities on all continents. That is why the multinationals and Western politicians are vigilant against any attempt to change the status quo in the present-day international structure of mass communication.

For US monopoly capital it is important that the dissemination on a vast scale, as is carried out for example by UP, should help to preserve in Asia, Africa and Latin America orders which suit imperialism, should keep those regions within the sphere of its domination, and instil bourgeois ideology, morals and tastes in the hope that all this will bring general strategic gain for imperialism as a whole and concrete multi-billion dollar profits for monopoly capital.

"Information imperialism" is termed such because the content of the information which these monopolies disseminate is imperialist and aims to preserve imperialism's political, economic and cultural positions in the modern world, which is why it slanders socialism, the Marxist-Leninist teaching and the revolutionary movement in the world, and tries to place the peoples and states in the wake of imperialist foreign policy.

Imperialist propaganda seeks to disorient the peoples of the developing states regarding the state of affairs in the young states that choose a socialist path of development or receive internationalist aid from the Soviet Union. There are continuous hostile campaigns against Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Cuba, Vietnam, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and Nicaragua. The information transnationals want to distort the essence of the present stage of the national liberation movement, at which the question is often raised not only of liquidating national oppression but all social oppression as well.

The world public knows of numerous instances in which the Western mass media, in the league with the CIA, were

directly involved with American and Western multinationals in opposing progressive regimes. The Salvador Allende government in Chile was a victim of such a plot. Exposure of CIA operations abroad and interference in the internal affairs of other countries naturally biases the developing countries against the West's information policy.

Of late, the worldwide imperialist information concerns have been distorting Soviet goals and motives on an incredible scale. The myths about a "Soviet threat" and Moscow's "expansion" and "hegemonistic strivings" now determine the direction of all Western information about the USSR. The world transnational press agencies, along with the entire imperialist press, have made anti-Sovietism and anti-communism an instrument for whipping up the arms race and influencing world public opinion so as to bring about a return to the cold war and get the developing countries to drop progressive transformations and an independent policy outside the framework of monopoly diktat.

Political leaders, the public and the masses in Asia, Africa and Latin America are increasingly dissatisfied with and have been protesting against the dominance of imperialist propaganda and information services in those regions. While resistance to "information imperialism" used to be manifested on specific occasions, sometimes taking the form of expelling Western journalists, closing correspondents' offices, etc., in the 1970s it turned more and more into an international movement with its own organisational mechanism and theoretical basis.

This process has developed in two basic directions. First, the concept of restructuring international information relations was gradually elaborated, developing into the slogan of a "new international information order" (NIIO). Second, the developing countries formed regional and international information associations.

The NIIO concept was advanced by the non-aligned movement between 1973 and 1976, the documents of the fourth summit being the first to speak of the need to overcome dependence on the West for information, a situation described as a "legacy of the colonial past", and to develop information cooperation between the developing countries themselves.

Two practical initiatives were taken in keeping with the

action programme adopted in Algiers. The Yugoslavian telegraph agency TANJUG assumed the function of distributing information received from the non-aligned countries, and in 1975 it started to put out news marked "pool". In March 1975 an important non-aligned symposium took place in Tunis and proposed in its final report that a study should be made of the non-aligned countries' mass media potential, and regional centres set up for exchanging experience between journalists and communication engineers with a view to further developing the necessary bases for producing and distributing information. The symposium formulated practical proposals for a gradual transition to a new international information order, the term being used for the first time there.

A July 1976 Delhi non-aligned information ministers conference elaborated the status of a Non-Aligned News Agencies Pool and two documents: "The Declaration of the New Delhi Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries" and a resolution entitled "Action Plan for Cooperation in the Field of Information and Mass Media".

The fifth non-aligned summit (1976), which combined the conclusions and recommendations of Tunis and Delhi, among them the one on the creation of some institutional bodies, included in its Political Declaration a number of articles on information which said that "a new international order in the fields of information and mass communications is as vital as a New International Economic Order", that there is an ever-growing gap between communication capacities in non-aligned and advanced countries, that this has created a situation of dependence and domination in which the majority of countries are reduced to being passive recipients of biased, inadequate and distorted information. It also said that the emancipation and development of national information media is therefore an integral part of the overall struggle for political, economic and social independence; and that the non-aligned countries must achieve these objectives through their own efforts as well as by more active cooperation on a bilateral, regional and inter-regional basis and by coordinating their activities in the UN and other international forums.

The sixth non-aligned summit (Havana, 1979) hailed the positive decisions on information taken at the UN General



Assembly's 33rd session with the help of non-aligned and other developing countries. Of great importance was the recognition by the summit of UNESCO's role in consideration of the problems of mass communication and in the efforts to set up a more balanced flow of information between developing and developed countries.

An analysis of the documents of subsequent major non-aligned forums—the seventh and eighth summits, the second conference of information ministers of non-aligned countries (Jakarta, January 1984), the first conference of non-aligned mass media experts (Delhi, December 1983)—confirm that the non-aligned states want to force the West to meet their demands for an end to a policy of neo-colonialism in the sphere of information.

In the way that it is gradually being reflected in non-aligned documents, the concept of a new international information order is closely linked with two other key concepts: decolonisation and development.

The process of economic decolonisation placed on the agenda the question of information independence just as at one time political emancipation of the developing countries raised the question of economic liberation. A new information order implies decolonisation of information exchange and cultural sovereignty, without which there cannot be complete decolonisation.

In the long run the noble goals of a NIIO meet the interests of both developing and developed countries. No global problem can be resolved without normalisation of international information exchange, without liquidation of the dictatorship of the Western monopolies in the non-socialist world.

The essence of the NIIO is a striving on the part of the developing countries for full sovereignty on questions of information and culture.

The creation of an international system of information and communication is currently under way, and most states want a system which would ensure international, many-sided and equal exchange of information.

A new international information order should help to ensure that the mass information systems develop and enrich the national cultures while making the achievements of national cultures available to the peoples of other countries.

Internationally, information should serve peace and cooperation between states, build trust between peoples and popularise the ideas of humanism.

A new international information order could take different forms, which will be determined by the character of the changes in international economic relations. If there are no cardinal changes of the economic order, the new international information order will be compromised by those who will try to turn it into yet another mechanism for increasing the developing countries' dependence on the transnationals.

The mechanism for considering the problems of information in the non-aligned movement took shape parallel with the promotion of the concept of a new international information order, its general outline being as follows.

The supreme body for considering these problems is the main non-aligned body—the conference of heads of state or government, which sets out its position in general political declarations.

The problems of information are discussed more in detail at information ministers conferences, two of which have so far been held—in 1976 in Delhi and in January 1984 in Jakarta.

Between conferences the leading body in this area is the Intergovernmental Council of Non-Aligned Countries for Coordination in the Field of Information, which was originally composed of 15 countries, the number rising later to 21 and finally to 38 (in Jakarta in early 1984).

A special body exists for consideration of technical questions—the international committee of telecommunication experts, which has done some work since its first meeting in Baghdad in 1977.

Of key significance in the effort to implement a new international information order is the News Agencies Pool of Non-Aligned Countries, which began to function in January 1975 and by the end of the year had 26 member agencies and had reported on 3,500 subjects.

On a decision of the first conference of information ministers and press agency heads of non-aligned countries (Delhi, July 1976), a 14-member pool coordinating committee was set up with outstanding Indian journalist and public figure D.R. Mankenar as its chairman.

Outlining his viewpoint on the principles of the pool's

functioning, Mankenar stated that the non-aligned information pool seeks merely to supplement rather than squeeze out the information services of the Western transnational agencies, and that the pool works on the principle of self-repayment: whoever sends information pays for its distribution. This principle makes unnecessary special investment to pay staff or maintain a headquarters. At the same time the user of the information has the right not to use it if it is considered unsuitable.

The fifth conference approved the statute of the News Agencies Pool, which says that the purpose of the pool is to provide objective information with an emphasis on progressive social, economic, political and cultural development. The association should not be an international news agency. None of the pool participants should play a dominant role. Each country must bear expenses in keeping with its participation. Participant agencies may send daily reports to any of the agencies that have volunteered (like TANJUG) to be regional centres for distribution of information. In addition, it was planned to coordinate exchange of articles, photographic material, and special economic and cultural information, and exchange of journalists and technical personnel. The summit also approved the creation of the Coordination Committee of the News Agencies Pool of Non-Aligned Countries and the Intergovernmental Council of Non-Aligned Countries for Coordination in the Field of Information.

The first session of the Coordination Committee of the Pool, which by then included 40 news agencies from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe, took place in January 1977 in Cairo. It noted that a number of countries had been acting as centres for distribution of information: Prensa Latina (Cuba), Samachar (India), Ghana News Agency, TANJUG (Yugoslavia), AIM (Mozambique), MAP (Morocco), INA (Iraq), APS (Algeria), TAP (Tunisia), ANTARA (Indonesia), AZAP (Zaire), ECI-Andina (Peru), MEN (Egypt), and the Ethiopian and Senegalese agencies.

Further sessions of the coordination Committee were held in Jakarta, Kinshasa, Belgrade, Managua and Delhi.

Despite the obvious objective and subjective difficulties in the work of the pool, it is a major achievement of the non-aligned countries and an instrument in the effort to

realise a new international information order. The pool has been growing and now includes more than 80 agencies and the volume of information distributed daily exceeds 60,000 words.

In addition to the press agencies pool there are other information associations of non-aligned countries—one inter-regional and several regional ones, all of which are gradually strengthening.

In October 1977 the founding conference of a new inter-regional association—the Organisation of Radio and Television Broadcasting of Non-Aligned Countries—was held in the Yugoslavian town of Sarajevo. The conference discussed cooperation in these spheres and elected a committee made up of representatives of Jordan, Iraq, India, Afghanistan, North Korea, Malaysia, Tunisia, Algeria, Guinea, Togo, Zaire, Nigeria, Tanzania, Kenya, Zambia, Cuba, Peru, Panama, and Yugoslavia, the last-named being elected chairman. The committee has held several meetings, and three conferences of the organisation.

The regional press agency associations have been doing a great deal of practical work to expand exchange of information between non-aligned countries. One of the first to be set up was the Caribbean News Agency (CANA), which came into being in 1977 on the basis of the Reuter agency regional network with the participation of 17 information organisations of 11 countries. The agency is not large and its information bodies are still strongly influenced by Western agencies.

It has taken many years to set up a regional information organisation in Asia. In 1961, at a Bangkok meeting, agencies from eight countries agreed to join such an association, which was named OANA—Organisation of Asia-Pacific News Agencies. The year 1981 was a turning point in the organisation's history, with nine agencies, among them TASS, being added to its membership of 14, bringing the number of OANA agencies to 23 from 19 countries of the region. The entry of agencies from socialist countries has brought substantial changes in the OANA Charter: a paragraph has been added to the section on the purposes of the organisation stating that OANA member agencies seek actively to liquidate the disbalance in the flow of information between developed and developing countries, and to pay

special attention to distributing information on combating poverty, hunger, unemployment and disease, on the efforts to achieve peace and mutual understanding between peoples, and oppose all forms and manifestations of racism and colonialism and neocolonialism.

Western governments and monopolies, especially the largest telegraph agencies, are annoyed at and fiercely oppose the attempts by Asian countries to decolonise information exchange. They try to disrupt OANA forums through intimidation in the press or through their agents in the information bodies or journalists on the continent.

In Africa, a major event in recent times in the area of information was the founding of the Pan-African News Agency (PANA), a process which took 13 years, the OAU Assembly finally approving its Charter at its summer 1976 session. But it was only in 1980 that its Intergovernmental Council, made up of 18 delegations from 15 countries, held its first session, its principal aim being to organise PANA's practical work. A decision was taken to begin distributing all necessary information, including political information, from July 1980, i.e. at the next OAU Assembly session.

However, problems of a largely technical and financial kind delayed PANA's scheduled start until 25 May 1983 when first communications were delivered. Twenty-six African states signed the agreement establishing PANA, but their number has been growing. The agency's headquarters is located in the Senegalese capital—Dakar.

PANA operates according to the principle that the agency relays information received from national agencies without any changes whatsoever, each agency having a quota of 1,000 words per day. In mid-1983 twenty countries were receiving relayed reports. The overall volume of information relayed by the agency is 20,000 words per day.

It also took several years to create a collective press agency in Latin America where, unlike Asia and Africa, the mass media were fairly developed, telegraph agencies existed, several regional journalistic organisations operated, and very diverse political forces were involved in shaping communication policy. Still, no funds were available to create a new agency.

In 1976, at the request of Latin American countries, UNESCO began to draw up a project for establishing a Latin

American Special Information Service (ALASEI), work on it continuing for several years.

The Latin American Economic System (LAES) did much to set up the ALASEI agency, initiating the formation in May 1981 of a committee to found such an agency, its members being Costa Rica, Cuba, Haiti, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and Peru. Peru later left the committee while Grenada, Bolivia, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and Ecuador joined it.

On 10 October 1983 the ALASEI agency began functioning. Its headquarters is located in Mexico. Its steering body is a council, and there is also an executive committee and an agency board. The council determines the agency's policy guidelines and activity, passes the budget, takes decisions on applications for membership, which must come from states that have an information agency, communication experts, regional journalists and research organisations, and makes amendments to the Charter. The council meets once a year.

While not exaggerating the significance and scale of these regional agencies, which do not yet compare with other major agencies, especially the worldwide ones, it is necessary to recognise their useful role in opposing "information imperialism" and welcome their tendency to growth.

The same may be said about other regional and inter-regional information associations of developing countries, which now number quite a few. The African, Asia-Pacific and Caribbean regions have their radio broadcasting unions. The Asia-Pacific union has a new permanent regional information exchange system called Asiavision which initially included eleven countries.

The Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) set up its own news agency—OPECNA—in 1979. In operation since 1980, the agency's purpose is to coordinate the information activity of member countries and expand information exchange between them, especially on matters connected with oil, the situation on the world market, and so on, and also on general problems of economic and social development. Located in Vienna and fitted with the latest equipment, the OPECNA headquarters is linked with 1,200 information bodies in most countries of the world. It has journalists working in Vienna and ten correspondents in

OPEC countries.

Also in existence are the Union of Arab News Agencies, the Organisation of News Agencies of Muslim States, and other associations.

The creation of regional information organisations in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the establishment of ties and cooperation between them and agency associations of non-aligned countries is supported by the non-aligned steering bodies, for the general problem of combating disinformation and working for a new international information order remains urgent.

The First Media Conference of Non-Aligned Countries (NAMECIA) in Delhi held in December 1983 discussed the tasks of journalists, including raising their professionalism, improving the quality of information distributed, being more prompt, etc. The calls made at the conference for a permanent organisation of journalists of non-aligned countries was not supported by most participants on the grounds that it would weaken the already existing worldwide democratic organisation of journalists.

In January 1984 the second non-aligned information ministers conference was held in Jakarta (the first took place in Delhi in 1976) and attended by delegations from 59 countries and observers from many international organisations, among them the UN and UNESCO.

The conference adopted a number of important documents which were on the whole anti-imperialist in spirit, for example an appeal to all states to support a new international information order, an action programme, and a resolution backing UNESCO's activity in international mass information.

The conference expanded the Inter-Governmental Coordinating Council of Non-Aligned Countries for Information from 21 to 38 members. In line with the principle of geographical distribution, 15 Council seats went to African countries, 6 to Latin American and Caribbean, 11 to Asia and Oceania, and 2 to Europe; also included *ex officio* on the Council were the chairman of the non-aligned movement (India), the chairman of the Information Ministers Conference (Iraq), and the chairman of the Inter-Governmental Coordinating Council of Non-Aligned Countries for Information (Tunisia).

A decision was taken in Jakarta to hold the fourth General Conference of News Agencies Pool of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana in 1985, and the third Information Ministers Conference in the capital of Zimbabwe.

On the whole the Jakarta conference once more demonstrated the resolve of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to continue and broaden the struggle to decolonise and democratise international exchange of information, and their growing opposition to Western "information imperialism". It is true to say that the developing countries' mechanism for cooperation in this area (political bodies at the level of state leaders and information ministers, and at the practical level the news agencies pool and other regional and inter-regional organisations) is steadily improving, expanding and strengthening.

Up to a certain time, the mid-1970s to be exact, the imperialist countries did not even want to hear about any changes in the "order" which they had established: domination and subordination in the area of international distribution of information. All demands of the developing countries were rejected out of hand as not serious and having no prospects. After the concept of a new international information order was put forward and steps taken simultaneously to set up a news agencies pool and other information bodies of non-aligned countries the imperialist states began to recognise the gravity of the threat facing them. It was then that they launched a counterattack against the developing countries, using political pressure, economic threats and financial blackmail.

Faced with the resistance of the imperialist states, the developing countries turned to the international organisations in an attempt through them to establish fully the concept of a new international information order and obtain assistance in setting up their own independent information organisations. An intense struggle has been under way in UNESCO for a number of years around documents proclaiming the developing countries' right to have their own voice in international information and calling for necessary help in this direction. At the last few UN General Assembly sessions, the developing countries have been sharply posing the question of restructuring relations in the sphere of information with account of their interests and place in the world.



Under these circumstances, the ruling quarters of the US and other Western countries have invigorated the drafting of measures to undermine the developing countries' anti-imperialist actions in the area of mass information. In a number of major capitalist countries, the USA first and foremost, versions of a new international information order are being elaborated which would mean even greater penetration of the news transnationals in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is claimed, for example, that before the developing countries are given the opportunity to use the latest technology and create competitive news agencies they will have to open their doors wider to the flow of information from the West as part of that same "new order". It is only evident that such an "order" would be turned into political and legal justification for the monopolies' interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

Unable to prevent the formation of the News Agencies Pool of Non-Aligned Countries, the Western "word monopolies" tried to penetrate the embryonic news agencies of the developing countries, water down the pool's anti-colonial platform, and hinder cooperation between the mass media of socialist and developing countries.

Following the establishment of the news pool, it was announced in the USA that a so-called "World Press Freedom Committee" was formed by the presidents of the largest newspaper and television networks. This committee has publicly promised "any assistance" to the news agencies of any developing countries which support the Western concept of "press freedom" and go along with the West in opposing the elaboration in international organisations of any norms and principles in the field of communication. At the same time the committee has launched a massive campaign to brainwash journalists from developing countries in a pro-Western and pro-American spirit.

Imperialism's agents in the developing countries have become more active, and attempts have been made to set up reactionary organisations in the sphere of information. In 1978 it was announced in Johannesburg that American monopolies were to finance an international agency called Global Press International to distribute information from South Africa, Chile, South Korea, Guatemala and Taiwan. The list of countries shows the obvious anti-communist

thrust of this agency, as it were.

It was also announced that an international organisation for freedom of the press and information was to be formed by the agencies of Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the USA and given a \$ 2 billion budget to combat communism and atheism and work for religious and moral values and human rights.

At an international conference convened by the Americans in 1978 in Cairo, the USA put forward a programme for creating a "multinational information pool" of capitalist and developing countries, to the exclusion of socialist states.

The task of liquidating "information imperialism" is just as difficult as achieving political and economic independence for it is not merely a question of a fight to win the sympathy of millions of people but actually of the prospects for the development of the young states. In this task, too, the non-aligned countries can depend on the support of the socialist community countries.

The Soviet Union has been giving Asia, Africa and Latin America substantial practical assistance to set up news agencies and communication systems, and in the training of national journalists. Radio stations, and radio relay lines, and TV centres built with Soviet help are in operation in a number of countries, and international communication installations are working successfully using Intersputnik satellites. In response to a UNESCO appeal, the Soviet Union has established special tariffs for developing countries for use of its communication equipment. The troposphere line between Moscow and Delhi is an interesting undertaking. Thousands of communication experts and journalists have been trained in the Soviet Union and at enterprises built with its participation abroad. This Soviet aid has no political strings attached and does not aim to enslave the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America economically and culturally.

The USSR also supports the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC), which was set up in 1980 under the auspices of UNESCO to mobilise funds to help the developing countries in the area of information. Its 35-nation Intergovernmental Council has considered more than 100 requests for telegraph agencies, radio-stations, printeries, schools of journalism, etc., to be set up

in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Soviet Union not only supported this programme from the very outset but was one of the first to contribute to its implementation, depositing 500,000 roubles in a special IPDC account, offering 50 scholarships annually (valued at roughly 1.5 billion roubles) to train information and communication experts from the developing countries in the USSR, and declaring its readiness to make experts and some equipment available within the IPDC framework. At IPDC sessions, the Soviet representatives consistently uphold the interests of the developing countries and seek to make this programme a real contribution to the democratic restructuring of international information exchanges.

The invitation to hold a session of the IPDC Intergovernmental Council in the capital of Soviet Uzbekistan—Tashkent—was seen as a manifestation of the USSR's great attention to the communication needs of developing states. At the session, held in September 1983, the Soviet delegation once again strongly supported the developing countries' demands and defended them against the attempts by the USA and its allies to impose on the IPDC forms of "aid" which would open the doors wider for penetration by Western monopolies into Asia, Africa and Latin America and enable them to lay their hands on the mass media bodies being set up there.

Of great interest to the information experts and journalists assembled in Tashkent was Soviet Uzbekistan's experience in setting up a very modern mass information system in a very short time span, that being possible because of the socialist system. Today Soviet Uzbekistan is well placed not only in Asia but throughout the world in many indicators in the sphere of mass communication (number of newspapers, publishing houses, radios, television sets).

Practical assistance to the developing countries (equipment, experts, experience) is a main direction of the Soviet Union's activity in this area.

Of equal importance is the support for the developing countries' demands for a restructuring of international relations in the sphere of communication with account of their legitimate interests. As a rule, socialist and developing countries take joint, agreed positions at the UN, UNESCO and other forums.

Yet note must be made of a certain inconsistency in the platform of a number of non-aligned countries which do not always appreciate the fundamental difference between the activity of the news agencies of socialist and capitalist states and accept the artificial division of the world into "North" and "South", "rich" and "poor". Attempts are being made to use such formulations to isolate the developing countries from their ally in the anti-imperialist struggle—the socialist community, thereby weakening the positions of the developing states themselves and making it more difficult for them to achieve their goals.

It should also be pointed out that the socialist countries see the task of restructuring international information relations as broader than mere decolonisation of information. Anti-communism and ideological subversion against the socialist countries is part and parcel of "information imperialism", and it would be an illusion to think that imperialism's information expansion can be defeated in Asia, Africa and Latin America while its "psychological war" against socialism, its enormous subversive and propaganda apparatus of anti-communism, and its interference in the affairs of others remain untouched.

Hence the conclusion that the struggle against reactionary imperialist propaganda and the theory and practice of "information imperialism", and for a restructuring of information relations on the basis of peaceful co-existence and recognition of states' sovereignty and equality should be waged jointly and in a coordinated fashion by socialist and developing countries.

## **The Ideological Struggle Around the Concept of Non-Alignment**

The non-aligned countries' agreed approach to the principal international problems sometimes hides sharp clashes between them, a struggle between the various concepts present in the circles of the movement which exert a considerable influence on the way individual members interpret the very principles, purposes and specific tasks of the movement.

The concepts which clash in the non-aligned movement reflect its complex social and political structure and the specific content given to the very notion of non-alignment by the various social forces in power in different developing countries. Still others are instigated by imperialism.

It is therefore not surprising that there has long been ideological struggle between various political forces around the doctrine of non-alignment and its implementation. Two main concepts have clashed in the movement itself—the anti-imperialist concept and the neutralist concept of “equidistance”.

The anti-imperialist concept in the non-aligned movement is one of principled and consistent struggle against all manifestations of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and the development of all-round ties with the USSR and the other socialist community countries, which are regarded as the most important buttress in the fight against imperialism. And certainly the main thing is not officially to proclaim that the socialist countries are the natural allies of the non-aligned movement but in fact to develop and strengthen cooperation between non-aligned and socialist states internationally. The anti-imperialist concept is held above all by Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, and the countries of socialist orientation. The question of close cooperation with the socialist states was discussed at the fourth non-aligned summit in

1973 in Algiers, and during the preparations for the sixth conference in Havana in 1979 it drew special attention.

That was a time when the political and military support of the USSR, Cuba and other socialist states had facilitated the victory of the Angolan revolution and the repulsion of aggression against Ethiopia; the April Revolution had taken place in Afghanistan and a revolutionary process was developing in a number of Latin American countries. Large sections of the people in the developing countries were increasingly clear on who was the friend and who the enemy of true independence. In these conditions, many non-aligned members began to focus attention primarily on the anti-imperialist direction of the movement. Such an approach is a purely formal one.

Addressing the fourth conference, Fidel Castro said that to deprive the movement of friendship with the socialist camp would mean weakening it and leaving it at the mercy of the still powerful forces of imperialism, which would be an improvident strategy and great political nearsightedness. That opinion is shared by many representatives of broad public circles in the developing world. One Indian researcher believes that the fact that both non-aligned and socialist countries take anti-war positions and resolutely oppose all forms of imperialism, aggression, racism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism makes inevitable the need for them to act jointly in the international arena. Another author, H. D. Malaviya, has written that the whole logic of the non-aligned movement requires that it constantly strengthen its ties with all anti-imperialist peace-loving forces, correctly seeing this as a possibility to enhance the movement's role as a truly independent force capable of making a contribution to the strengthening of peace and the general anti-imperialist struggle and thereby promoting its initial goals.<sup>1</sup> But such a direction does not suit the West at all.

The imperialist quarters, the US administration first and foremost, have been doing everything to weaken the anti-imperialist trend of the movement, undermine its fundamental principles, and prevent cooperation with the socialist states in the international arena. The long-term ob-

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Malaviya, *Non-Alignment Onward March*, New Literature, 1981, p. 91.

jective is to draw the movement into the orbit of imperialist influence.

Ideological "brainwashing" of non-aligned members is meant to make it easier to attain those objectives and Western politicians, political scientists and the major mass media have therefore been trying to impose a number of concepts and views on movement members. Thus, while recognising the importance of normal, stable relations between the USA and the young states, relations marked by a spirit of cooperation, many American political analysts now feel that Washington should direct this process into a "positive channel", change the movement from within and degut it so as to bring it in line with American interests. A special feature of imperialism's ideological expansion in respect of the movement is that it takes several directions at once. First of all there is the striving to undermine or weaken the pivotal aims of the anti-imperialist doctrine of non-alignment, move the liberated countries away from anti-imperialist struggle, impose on the movement views and ideas advantageous to imperialism, and strike at the all-round cooperation with the socialist community. Thus, the concept of "equidistance" is meant to make the anti-imperialist trend of non-alignment "harmless", the concept of "universalism" or "globalism"—to "dissolve" the movement's traditional anti-colonialist and anti-neocolonialist "tricontinentalism", and the concept of "true" or "pure" non-alignment—to split the movement through contrast with the "pseudo non-alignment" of Cuba and Vietnam and a number of states of socialist orientation which consistently champion an anti-imperialist course. The aim is to isolate those non-aligned members by contrasting them with non-aligned countries which the West regards as "models" and which maintain close ties with the West and are pro-imperialist on a number of questions.

Simultaneously, persistent attempts are made to falsify the very history of non-alignment and to contrast its activity in the 1960s with that of the 1970s and early 1980s. The ideologists of imperialism, who reacted in a hostile manner to the very doctrine of non-alignment, are now urging the movement's leaders to "return" to its original principles, which are supposedly based on "true non-alignment". It is obviously hoped that Asia and Africa have forgotten

the unprecedented persecution of non-alignment at the end of the 1950s and early 1960s, years which the West now claims were the movement's "golden age".

The concept of "equidistance" neutralise the activity of the movement, it fetters the non-aligned countries and prevents them from taking positions dictated by their national interests. Exposing the roots of "equidistance", the Yugoslavian magazine *Review of International Affairs* wrote that the West has been imposing the theory of "equidistance" from the blocs, arguing that it is necessary to take an "objective position" between the two blocs, a situation which is neutralising the activity of non-aligned countries and turning them into an amorphous mass of passive observers instead of active participants in international relations. The magazine went on to say that this approach to non-alignment reflects a desire to remove non-alignment from active international life, exclude it from the process of resolving international questions or at least turn it against "Soviet hegemonism or expansionism."<sup>1</sup> That is an accurate description of the anti-Soviet trend of the "equidistance" concept.

The concept of "equidistance" goes back a long way, and its political meaning and content have been substantially transformed over the past 25-30 years.

In the 1950s and 1960s, as countries of Asia and Africa were gaining political independence and their relations with the USSR were still embryonic, a policy of "equidistance" was on the whole a progressive, anti-imperialist one. In the specific historical conditions at that time, "equidistance", which was often accompanied by an emphasis on neutrality, meant primarily a "disconnection" by the Afro-Asian countries from the former mother countries and a desire to establish ties with other countries, including socialist ones. This policy was frequently followed by political leaders who were ideologically very far from communism.

West European states and the USA did everything possible to limit the foreign policy activity of the young states and to draw them into various military and political blocs. During that period their "equidistance" was clearly not to the liking of the West.

<sup>1</sup> *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, No. 770, 5 May 1982, p. 5.



However, as many independent countries established and strengthened all-round ties with the USSR, the imperialist strategists began gradually to reconsider their attitude to the concept of "equidistance", seeing that in the new conditions it could be a means of limiting or at least slowing down the further bringing of the developing world closer to the socialist community.

The imperialist circles hope that by deliberately heightening international tension they will find it easier to make non-aligned countries adhere to the principle of "equidistance" than they did under detente when, as experience showed, it was more difficult to impose this concept. And there is good reason why the 1970s and detente hold a special place in the history of non-alignment. That was a time when the liberation wars in Vietnam, Laos, Mozambique, Angola and Kampuchea were triumphant, when radical revolutionary change took place in Ethiopia, Afghanistan and Nicaragua, and the developing countries were especially active on the economic front of struggle against imperialism. All this was also reflected in a radicalisation of the movement's actions on the key political and economic problems of the day. The sixth non-aligned summit (Havana, 1979) summed up the results of that whole historical period.

In its efforts to impose "equidistance" on the movement, imperialism makes use of some ideas that are current in the developing world, above all it makes a fetish of a "non-bloc" policy which is pursued by certain quarters of the movement. This policy is often portrayed as all but the developing countries' principal contribution to world development, to the efforts to improve the international situation and democratise international relations. However, in practice this means identifying the "blocs" not only with NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation but also with the opposing socio-economic systems themselves. This approach confuses the concepts "socio-economic system" and "military political bloc", all but equates world socialism with imperialism as a source of danger, including military danger, to the young states, and sees the non-aligned movement as the sole consistent proponent and "true" guarantor of peace. It fundamentally distorts the existing state of affairs, belittles the role of world socialism in the struggle for peace, places its efforts to maintain the military strategic parity so as to

curb imperialism's aggressive ambitions in the same category with the arms race policy of the imperialist militarists, opposes socialism to the national liberation movement, and divides them as allies in the fight for peace and against imperialism.

The holding of formally identical positions with respect to the various military and political groupings does not mean that the non-aligned states should keep an "equal distance" from the imperialist camp and the socialist community. While outwardly a refusal to align with blocs, non-alignment was in practice a rejection of the bloc policy pursued by only one of those systems—imperialism, and not by both, for it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has never aimed to draw any independent country into the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. No Soviet-created bloc has ever existed in Asia or Africa, which is why the anti-bloc foreign policy was bound to take on an anti-Western, anti-imperialist character, for it was the USA and its NATO partners which did everything to involve the young states in the various military and political blocs which they set up in the zone of their former colonial periphery.

Some non-aligned members pretend that the concept of "equidistance" expresses the desire of most member countries for independence and the chance to pursue a truly independent foreign policy free from the influence of or subordination to any external forces.

The non-aligned states' desire to pursue an independent foreign policy is by no means a manifestation of "equidistance". Indian author K. P. Misra has written: "As always it is now desirable that the non-aligned movement retains its independent, non-bloc and centrist thrust in so far as East-West conflict is concerned. Without violating the basic criteria agreed upon at Belgrade in 1961—dissociation from military arrangements conceived in the great power rivalry—a non-aligned country should be left free to fashion the contents of its relations with great powers, keeping in view its needs and requirements."<sup>1</sup>

In practice, however, most non-aligned countries on the whole adhere to an anti-imperialist rather than an "equidis-

<sup>1</sup> *Non-Alignment in the Eighties, International Round Table*, Petrovaradin, Yugoslavia, 28-31 August 1981, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, 1982, p. 25.

tant" policy. The struggle to preserve peace and strengthen their political and active economic independence inevitably places non-aligned countries at odds with imperialism and objectively brings them closer to the USSR and other socialist states, even if an individual leader may not wish that to be so.

During the 37th General Assembly in 1982, non-aligned countries joined the USSR in its vote on an average of 80 occasions out of 100, and on only 20 occasions they sided with the USA. The results of voting on the main issues were roughly the same at the 38th session. Or another example: the Political Declaration of the seventh summit contained not a single criticism of the USSR. The influential Swiss newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* wrote that while, for example, the USSR was not even mentioned in connection with the Afghan question, the US was often "categorically put in the pillory for its interference in Central America and its policy in the Middle East and southern Africa."<sup>1</sup>

There is good reason why the results of the Delhi forum forced the US State Department to issue a special statement on 15 March 1983 denouncing the declaration as "in many respects an unbalanced and polemical document which does not reflect the principles of non-alignment which the movement proclaims" and expressing regret at that.<sup>2</sup> It comes as no surprise that the USA found this document unfortunate, but the rest of the statement is puzzling. Since when has Washington, which inspired the policy of knocking together aggressive military and political blocs, assumed the right to interpret non-aligned principles? It seems that the USA—the NATO leader—is the only one concerned to keep non-aligned principles pure!

Washington described the Delhi document as "unbalanced" and "polemical" above all because of its "unfair attacks on the United States in the political part of the declaration" and "absence of any criticism of the Soviet Union", which according to the State Department, "detract from the credibility of the declaration and reflect the continuing ability of the radical elements within the non-aligned movement to manipulate it".<sup>3</sup> It is certainly not a matter of the influence

<sup>1</sup> *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 15 March 1983.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from: *The Times of India*, 16 March 1983, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

of radical elements in the movement, which, as is well known, are a minority and are no longer able to impose their line on the majority of non-aligned countries.

The essence of the matter is quite different: how can one take a "balanced" attitude to the proponents and opponents of imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism? How can one take a "balanced" attitude to the proponents and opponents of nuclear war, the arms race, a ban on all forms of aggression, and peaceful co-existence?

The US State Department statement contained a veiled threat to the effect that Washington would continue to hope that the non-aligned movement would more conscientiously abide by its principles in the future. In other words, the 101 non-aligned members have not been implementing their principles in good faith, while the USA has been concerning itself day and night with their purity. The USA has been using all means to impose an "equidistance" policy on the movement, but on the whole its policy is by no means one of "equidistance" for such a policy with respect to the military and political blocs (always and regardless of circumstances) would inevitably doom any non-aligned foreign policy action to failure and would make the non-aligned countries passive contemplators of international life. The influential West German magazine *Europa-Archiv* wrote in this context that if a policy of "equidistance" from the military blocs is applied in every situation, that is precisely what will make it impossible for the non-aligned countries to take an independent positions".<sup>1</sup>

Most non-aligned countries assess any international problem, including each conflict, depending on its specific features and support that side in the international arena whose stance is regarded as the most just and in keeping with member countries' interests. "Non-alignment does not stand for *a priori* equidistance in relationship to the big powers," writes Yugoslav author Dimče Belovski, "but determines its attitude according to the concrete policy, stands and positions of whatever international subject, including the big powers."<sup>2</sup>

The "equidistance" concept reflects the position of certain

<sup>1</sup> *Europa-Archiv*, Folge 3, 10, February 1980, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Non-Alignment in the Eighties...*, p. 36.

circles in the movement that are interested in balancing internationally between the two military and political blocs for political and economic gain. In a more general form, "equidistance" is often an attempt to "balance" anti-imperialist slogans on certain questions with more or less masked anti-Sovietism on others.

Thus, a number of members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which places great emphasis on its non-bloc character, takes anti-imperialist positions on the Middle East and sharply criticises American-Israeli military and political cooperation while openly declaring its hostility toward revolutionary Afghanistan and making no secret of its political, and often even military, assistance to the rebels fighting against the Afghan government, which is supported by the USSR and other socialist states and all progressive forces.

A number of non-aligned countries often combine an anti-imperialist position on many international issues with support for the Khmer reaction, which is backed by imperialist and hegemonistic forces, and with a blocking of People's Republic of Kampuchea participation in the non-aligned movement and of the restoration of its legitimate rights in the UN.

At the same time it is evident that both conceptually and practically "equidistance" is a phenomenon that is applied differently to individual non-aligned countries. For some countries that are now closely linked with the USA, it would mean, even in our day, renunciation of unilateral orientation on that imperialist power and the development of ties with socialist states. And it would be naive to think that the West would support such "equidistance".

"Equidistance" as a criterion of loyalty to non-alignment is openly used by the "neutralists" in the movement to attack its anti-imperialist wing, especially the socialist countries and states of socialist orientation, for their being "too close" to the socialist community. They are accused of pursuing a foreign policy which serves the "interests" of the USSR and other socialist states, which allegedly use them to impose unsuitable resolutions on the movement. Particularly sharp attacks have been made against Cuba and Vietnam, which were accused of breaching the principle of maintaining the same attitude to the "two superpowers".

The "equidistance" concept also has an economic equiva-

lent—the theory of “equal responsibility” of all developed countries for overcoming the backwardness of the developing world, a theory which makes the eclectic “rich North-poor South” concept all but an official non-aligned doctrine, and encourages it to make similar demands on capitalist and socialist countries. Invented in the West, this theory has gained supporters in the movement, but the progressive forces of the developing world resolutely reject it.

It is significant that some states’ desire to maintain an “equal distance” from the two military and political groups has also long been exerting a peculiar influence on the domestic policy and socio-economic measures in a number of non-aligned countries, for example the peculiar combination of development of the state sector and a planned economy with incentives to private national and foreign capital. This is inevitable, but such a situation cannot continue forever. The fact that economic aid is received from the USSR and other socialist states to create and develop a state sector, and from the West largely to develop the private sector is used by certain quarters in the non-aligned movement to prove that they want a socio-economic model which combines elements of the two opposed systems—socialism and capitalism. Some circles in non-aligned countries claim that the combination of these measures will contribute to the emergence of a new “mixed economy” different from both the socialist and capitalist economy. But, as Kwame Nkrumah, an outstanding leader of the African national liberation movement, once stated: “There is no middle road between capitalism and socialism... Is it possible, either in terms of ideology or practical politics, in the ever-sharpening conflict between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces in the world to adopt a position of neutrality or non-alignment?”<sup>1</sup>

It is important to note that in the 1970s certain circles of the movement started to replace the term “equidistance” with a new formulation—“equal proximity” of non-aligned countries to the two military and political groups. However, the meaning of the new term is the same: movement members are *a priori* expected to maintain an “equal distance”

<sup>1</sup> Kwame Nkrumah, *Revolutionary Path*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, p. 436.

from the world of socialism and the imperialist states, and substitution of one term for another means no fundamental change whatsoever.

Whether individual non-aligned leaders like it or not, "equidistance" objectively creates a basis for isolation of the movement and a broadening of its ties with imperialism. "Approval" of the concept by the USA and other Western powers is indicative of a desire to remove all progressive and anti-imperialist content from non-alignment, making use of members' social and political heterogeneity and eventually hoping to undermine the movement from within.

Rebuffing those who claim that a truly non-aligned country is equidistant from East and West, especially from the USA and the USSR, Indian researcher Rasheeddin Khan noted that there was nothing more hypocritical and dangerous for non-alignment than agreement with this theory. It should be remembered that the non-aligned movement was basically directed against the domination of the West and not of the East, and it is therefore quite impermissible to place the "two superpowers"—the USA and the USSR—in the same category. Non-alignment means a state's refusal to join any bloc for military purposes, but it does not bar states from joining alliances for peaceful purposes in order to develop the states themselves. A classic example of that is the 1971 Soviet-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. "The last decade has revealed" writes Khan, "that India has not deviated from the major principles of non-alignment by signing that treaty; nor has the Soviet Union ever tried India's non-alignment status. Indeed on the contrary that treaty constitutes a triumph for non-alignment in terms of maximising national interests."<sup>1</sup>

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the imperialist circles instigated the right-wing forces in the movement to step up their efforts to impose "equidistance" in the new form of so-called "true" or "pure" non-alignment.

Characteristically, since the early 1980s the USA and other Western powers have repeatedly stated that true non-alignment is an important stabilising factor in international relations because it is the best strategy for resisting the

<sup>1</sup> *Perspectives on Non-Alignment*, Edited by R. Khan, Prakashan (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 1981, pp. 32-33.

Soviet Union's direct and indirect attempts to spread its political influence to the developing countries.

Since the early 1980s, NATO Council sessions have invariably made a positive assessment of the so-called "true non-alignment". The magazine *NATO's Fifteen Nations* makes clear what is meant by that term: "The democracies accepted non-alignment as a constructive policy as long as it was not just a fig-leaf for pro-Communist or pro-Soviet attitudes."<sup>1</sup>

The concept of "true non-alignment" and "equidistance" deprives the movement of a clear political orientation and only serves to lead it away from its original anti-imperialist goals and isolate non-aligned countries in the world arena from their friends in the joint struggle for peace, peaceful co-existence and social progress.

As international tension heightened in the early 1980s, certain circles of the non-aligned movement began to put forward the concept that the movement is "against super-power politics", the essence of this concept being to portray American and Soviet policy as a manifestation of military and political rivalry for influence over the developing countries.

The axis of international politics is supposedly not the struggle between the two opposed socio-economic and political systems but the clash of the "global interests" of the USA and the USSR, which both want to dominate militarily and politically. The struggle between them is said to be the main reason for the heightened international tension. This approach places equal responsibility for this heightened tension on both "superpowers", with no account of who is to blame for the dangerous international situation.

Accepting these incorrect ideas, which clearly favour the West since they actually relieve it of blame for the aggravation of the world situation and place that blame on the USSR as well, some non-aligned leaders believe that in the present conditions the movement should place emphasis rather on its character as an organisation that is "against superpower politics" than on its traditional anti-bloc policy, and should as far as possible avoid being drawn into the military and political confrontation between the USA and

<sup>1</sup> *NATO's Fifteen Nations*, Vol. 27, No. 4, August-September 1982, p. 30.



the USSR. These views have also been reflected in the seventh conference's political declaration.

There are a number of reasons for the concept of the movement being "against superpower politics": the military and political parity between the USA and the USSR, the definite tactical differences in the approach of the USA and other NATO members to the non-aligned movement, as a result of which some non-aligned countries believe that there is no need to parade its "anti-bloc" character, i.e. the fact that it takes the same attitude to all "superpowers", and the nationalist sentiments of some non-aligned leaders, who see the world not as an arena of struggle between two opposing social and political systems but primarily as a sphere of the clash of interests of the "two superpowers".

To approach the question this way means deliberately obscuring the completely different socio-economic essence of the USA and the USSR and to try to place the great peace-loving country of socialism and imperialism's greatest aggressive state in one and the same camp. The real interests of non-aligned countries require that other states be treated not according to their size, power or wealth but according to their adherence to the principles of anti-imperialist struggle and desire for peace underlying the movement itself. Only in that way can they decide the important question of who is their friend and who their enemy.

The forerunner of the "two superpowers" concept was the "theory" advanced in the early 1970s by nationalist leaders of some developing countries regarding the so-called "two imperialisms", which supposedly constitute an equal threat to their political independence and independent foreign policy. The "two imperialisms" theory was heatedly discussed at the fourth non-aligned summit in 1973 in Algiers, when some members attempted to get this "thesis", with varying nuances, included in the political and economic documents of the conference. Addressing the conference, Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro gave a strong rebuff to the attempts to oppose the developing countries' interests to the socialist community, and to slander the USSR's peace-promoting policy. He said that the theory of two imperialisms, one led by the United States and the other supposedly by the Soviet Union, which has been encouraged by capitalism's theoreticians, has found an echo among the

press and leaders of non-aligned countries, sometimes consciously and sometimes because of ignorance of history and the modern world. He added, that this is further promoted by those who, while taking so-called revolutionary positions, unfortunately betray the cause of internationalism.<sup>1</sup>

The progressive forces of the developing world and many authoritative public figures of non-aligned countries have repeatedly rebuffed any attempt to place the Soviet Union, that great socialist state, in the same category with the United States of America. Thus, the overwhelming majority of those attending the Sixth Congress of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO), held in late May 1984 in Algiers, did not support the attempt to push the thesis of the need for developing states to keep "equidistant from the two superpowers", which are said to be equally to blame for the dangerous tension in the world and the difficult economic situation of Afro-Asian states. The leaders of many countries adhere to that realistic course. Significant in this regard was the speech by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamed in spring 1984 at a meeting of the US Foreign Policy Association and US Council on Foreign Relations in Washington, in which he regretted that a country as great as the United States so often takes positions opposed to those of the small "Third World" countries. On such issues as a new international economic order, a treaty on the law of the sea, exploration of the Antarctic, multilateral trade talks and the situation in UNESCO, the United States follows a policy at odds with that of the Third World. Notwithstanding the complexity of the world situation, there is an increasing understanding in developing countries of who is really to blame for the worsening international climate and whose policy is directly opposed to the vital interests of non-aligned members.

"Equidistance", "true non-alignment", and "opposition to superpower politics" are not the only issues around which there is an ideological struggle in the non-aligned movement. The concept of the movement's "universality" and "globalisation" have been especially current of late, having appeared as a result of the numerical growth of the movement. Up to 1973, all movement members except

<sup>1</sup> *El Moudjahid*, 8 September 1973, p. VII.

Cuba and Yugoslavia were countries of Asia and Africa, but in the 1970s the movement rapidly expanded to other continents, giving rise to the idea of its tendency to ward "universalisation" and "globalisation" through inclusion not only of countries of Latin America but also small and medium sized countries of Europe, the latter being not only neutral countries that had for some years been "guests" and "observers" at non-aligned conferences, but also NATO and Warsaw Treaty states. Those who want the movement to expand as much as possible point out that it has long gone both beyond the traditional framework of the Afro-Asian world and beyond the immediate boundaries of the developing world as a whole and non-alignment can no longer be identified only with that world. The ideas of non-alignment, they continue, are also spreading in some Mediterranean NATO countries which are traditionally closely connected historically, economically and geographically with states of Northern Africa and Levant. Named among these countries are Spain, Portugal and Greece, which was active in the drafting of the joint address to the great powers by six countries—Greece, Sweden, India, Mexico, Argentina and Tanzania. One London magazine writes that the principal goal of the Greek government, led by the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), is to create a strong community of non-aligned countries and achieve military and economic independence, and that the call for a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans is part and parcel of that strategy.

. The objective coincidence of the positions of most Afro-Asian countries with those of some Latin American and West European countries on international problems is undoubtedly a positive fact, but it is used to push into the background the original anti-colonial, anti-imperialist character of the movement. Those who advocate this concept are the relatively economically developed movement members that frequently lay claim to the role of regional centres of political and economic influence and sometimes seek to associate themselves rather with countries of middle capitalist development such as Spain, Portugal and Greece, than with Asian and African countries.

The concept of the movement's "globalisation" was reflected in the Political Declaration of the seventh summit in Delhi. Some claim that non-alignment has become a "global

system". Indeed, as has already been noted, there is greater interest in the movement on the part of various political parties and organisations of West European countries, including some NATO countries. In some of those countries special attention is paid to questions of participation or non-participation in that bloc, liquidation of American military bases and Euromissiles, and simultaneous disbandment of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

However, these undoubtedly positive tendencies are being used to substantiate the thesis that the two important features of the non-aligned movement—a non-bloc foreign policy orientation and economic underdevelopment—are less and less its exclusive characteristics.

The conclusion is drawn from all this that the rejection of "tricontinentalism" in the non-aligned movement is a direct result of the processes mentioned and is the reason for the inclusion of a new chapter on Europe in the Final Act of the 1983 seventh conference in Delhi.

The universality of the non-aligned doctrine is substantiated not only by the movement's quantitative growth but also by the fact that it includes even areas which were considered the natural property of the blocs. Here again one can see the attempt to identify the movement's "globalisation" with its "equidistance".

However, can one use the arguments cited above, for example the inclusion of a chapter on Europe in the Political Declaration of the Delhi conference, to claim that "tricontinentalism" has been rejected? Certainly not.

The non-aligned movement emerged as a coordinating centre for the collective diplomacy of the newly-independent countries and took shape as the largest inter-state political association of the developing world.

The entry into the movement of countries of other regions does not actually change anything in this regard and does not mean that the movement has lost its "tricontinental" character, which is determined primarily by the fact that the absolute majority of members are countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and that it focuses on political and economic problems.

Certainly, the increase in the number of member states belonging to different regions but taking anti-imperialist positions objectively makes the movement more representa-

tive and increases the role and influence of non-alignment internationally, but that does not mean that the movement has become a truly global factor of modern international relations.<sup>1</sup> The aim of such a transformation would obviously be to move the movement away from mainly defence of the political and economic interests of most of its members, i.e. the developing countries, and reorient its political strategy in such a way as to make the movement pay paramount attention not to anti-imperialism but to "opposing a bloc policy", to a "two superpowers policy", i.e. to the very same "equidistance" from the world of socialism and the world of capitalism, which would again be in the interests of imperialism.

Examining the question of whether non-alignment is a "universal" concept, Soviet researcher R. A. Tuzmukhamedov quite correctly states that if that is taken to mean "worldwide and global" then it is not an accurate description. First of all for the simple reason that there are several dozen member states of military alliances—associations opposed by non-aligned countries—and their participants cannot be considered non-aligned. The stance taken on this question by most participants of the fifth conference in 1976 in Colombo (among other things, their refusal for that reason to admit Portugal, Romania and the Philippines as members) is convincing enough. Furthermore, if not in keeping with the letter then certainly in keeping with the idea and practice of non-alignment, the three largest world powers and the leading industrialised capitalist countries may not be members of the movement. Finally, it should be recalled that if the concept of non-alignment is conceived as universal, i.e. that all states may become non-aligned, then the concept itself becomes meaningless, at least semantically. Indeed, presenting the matter this way would eventually send the non-aligned movement along a path of self-negation. Without belittling the significance of the non-aligned movement, it should be stated that a greater role for non-aligned countries internationally has nothing in common with the attempts to present non-alignment as a "universal" phenomenon.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example: Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, *North over South. A Non-Western Perspective of International Relations*, South Asian Publishers Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, Madras, 1982.

Thus, in considering some concepts that are current in the movement's political circles and exert a certain influence both on the formulation of its general position and on the foreign policy of individual members, it should again be stressed that these concepts are above all a reflection of the complex internal social and political structure of the movement. The influence of this or that concept on the movement's policy on specific international issues is inseparably connected with the correlation and struggle of various forces in the elaboration of an agreed approach and in decision-making in each individual case.

The imperialist circles make broad use of such concepts as "equidistance", "opposition to superpower politics", "universalisation" and "globalisation" in their strategic objective of removing all anti-imperialist content from the non-aligned movement and weakening non-aligned cooperation with the world socialist community.

This course of imperialism, US imperialism above all, is one direction of its general subversive activity against the non-aligned movement.

## **Imperialist Subversion of the Non-Aligned Movement**

What is it that determines the imperialist states' policy toward the non-aligned movement? Primarily the class interests of the Western countries' monopolist ruling clique, namely, the desire to maintain control over the policy and economy of the independent states and turn them into a political appendage of imperialism in its fight against the world of socialism, and an unwillingness or inability positively to accept the independent foreign policy of the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the modern world.

There is an obvious difference in the approaches of the USA, on the one hand, and other developed capitalist countries, on the other. The former mother countries, Britain and France for example, in principle responded to the non-aligned slogans with scarcely veiled irritation but outward neutrality from the moment they appeared to the point of their materialisation in the non-aligned movement. Their ruling circles felt that these slogans and the movement itself as a whole did not prevent the former mother countries from maintaining a definite system of ties with the former colonies and semi-colonies since their system of ties was not directly related to combating the world of socialism but was rather directed at preserving the influence of the former mother countries.

The US position was different: its ruling circles saw the liberation process of the former colonies and semi-colonies as a signal to begin actively to penetrate their economy and try to control their policy. US policy made great use of anti-communist and anti-Soviet slogans as a screen for Washington to establish its control in the former colonial world without displeasing its closest allies.

The 1947 Truman Doctrine was the first US attempt to combine anti-communist slogans with penetration into the

former colonies and semi-colonies. This “doctrine” claimed, among other things, that all liberation process inside and outside Europe are a variety of “Soviet subversion”. Assuming the function of Western leader in the fight against socialism, the United States simultaneously laid claim to the “leading role” in the colonies and semi-colonies where the liberation struggle was developing. Wanting US support, the former mother countries accepted this formulation although they could not but understand that the US was talking about controlling their own possessions.

A desire to rely on American support in the fight against socialism and simultaneously against the liberation processes in the colonies led the West European countries to join NATO. For Washington this diplomatic victory meant that it could reshape the spheres of influence in the former colonies in such a way that all the most valuable and attractive of them would fall into its orbit. All these calculations were hidden behind deafening anti-Soviet rhetoric.

Dominant in Washington’s strategic plans was a “contrast” perception of the alignment of world forces—a Pax Americana against socialism, which was later called the “bi-polar world” in special literature. This alignment of forces simply left no place for any intermediary or “neutralist” positions. It did not even countenance mention of the young nations’ right to any independent foreign policy position.

In this sense India’s non-aligned slogans of the late 1940s were completely at odds with the way the American ruling circles saw the future of the colonial peoples. Their aim was (and still is) not merely to penetrate the markets of the former colonies and semi-colonies but to secure their political and even military orientation under American “leadership”, as was effected with Latin American states by the creation of the Organisation of American States (OAS) in 1948. In principle Washington’s diplomatic and military departments planned the same fate for Southeast Asia and the Far East, and the Middle East and Southern Asia.

That is why the Indian government’s concept of non-alignment, put forward in that period, immediately met with a hostile response from Washington. The break-up of the British and French colonial empires and the weakening of Britain and France suited the American ruling clique, but the fact that the emergent countries then dared to proclaim



their own concept of foreign policy ran counter to the US desire to turn them into an appendage of an American global "empire".

True, there were those in US political circles at that time who favoured a careful approach to non-alignment concepts. Among them was the then American ambassador to India Chester Bowles<sup>1</sup>, who, along with other bourgeois liberals, regarded India's non-aligned slogans as a desire on the part of the government to refrain from active participation in world affairs while the young states were being formed, and as a possible model for tearing the socialist countries of Europe and Asia from the Soviet Union in the future. But most people in the US ruling quarters did not support these recommendations.

In the 1950s, serious conflicts arose between US policy and the countries which supported non-aligned slogans, conflicts heightened by some circumstances of that period.

The 1952 US elections brought to power the Dwight Eisenhower Republican Administration, with John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. For countries with a neutralist orientation, this was of great significance for at the turn of the 1950s Dulles had suggested a number of political guidelines that were aimed directly against the non-aligned slogans. In 1950 he sent a memorandum to the Senate claiming that all revolutionary change in the world, including in the colonies, is part of a single "pattern of violence" worked out and directed from Moscow. In 1950 and 1951, while on diplomatic service in the Democratic Administration and specialising in Asian affairs, Dulles clearly and unambiguously condemned the non-aligned slogans. He had but one programme for the independent countries: all of them should enter the US "sphere of influence" by signing appropriate treaties and agreements with that country.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, between 1950 and 1952 the US National Security Council (NSC) drafted and adopted a number of documents formulating the goals and tasks of policy toward

<sup>1</sup> Later, in 1971, Bowles published a special article on US policy in Asia entitled *Five Major Blunders by the US in Asia*. *Saturday Review*, 6 November 1971, pp. 28-31). He includes among these mistakes the fact that the US government never did understand the political views of the Indian government and in fact became an enemy of India, with all the consequences.

<sup>2</sup> Townsend Hoopes, *The Devil and John Foster Dulles*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston-Toronto, 1973, pp. 100-116.

the independent countries. The documents essentially said that the United States should seek to conclude a series of treaties and agreements on the basis of the law on bilateral security passed by the US Congress in 1951 with countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America so as to set up a global system of American "undertakings". During that period agreements were signed with Taiwan, South Korea, the Philippines, Japan and Spain; Greece and Turkey were included in the NATO bloc; the "Marshall Plan" was applied to the Middle East; and a treaty was concluded on the creation of the ANZUS bloc. Also on the agenda was the establishment of a pro-American Mid-East bloc (George McGhee, special US ambassador to the region, held talks on this in 1951).

And, finally, in the 1950s a number of Asian and African states (among them Libya, Tunisia, Morocco and Ghana) were expected to achieve independence, and the United States believed that these countries, too, should enter its sphere of influence.

Thus, US policy included all the prerequisites for actively opposing the non-aligned slogans and imposing on the liberated countries the American concept of an international political orientation, i.e. those countries' submission to American diktat and control. And the Eisenhower administration lost no time in attempting to implement this concept.

In May 1953 Dulles made a tour of the Middle East, focussing on a meeting with Gamal Abdel Nasser, leader of the Egyptian revolution, during which the possibility was examined of setting up an anti-Soviet grouping in the Middle East under the US aegis. Nasser rejected these plans and supported the concept of non-alignment, thereby sparking off a sharp deterioration in American-Egyptian relations. Irrespective of the nature of their ties with the USA, most Arab states supported Egypt's position.

But the 1953 setback in the Middle East did not discourage American diplomacy. The very next year, the United States was actively pushing the idea of a bloc of Southeast Asian states (SEATO), and in 1955 pressed for the signing of the "Baghdad Pact" by Great Britain, Iraq, Iran, Turkey and Pakistan (in 1958, following the revolution in Iraq and its government's refusal to continue as a

member of this organisation, it was renamed SENTO). The United States itself did not formally join SENTO (the USA only participated in the work of some of its bodies) but in 1959 it signed bilateral agreements with Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, making them members and leaders of that bloc.

Throughout the 1950s the United States pursued a policy of an offensive against the national liberation movement. Its efforts to create its own neocolonial "empire" through knocking together blocs and other military and political groups by making "commitments" for military and economic aid<sup>1</sup> was but one direction of this policy. Others were: military involvement in the struggle against the national liberation movements in the southern Korean Peninsula, in Indo-China, in Lebanon, and in countries of Africa and Latin America, and stepped up diplomatic and economic pressure on the emerging non-aligned movement.

Townsend Hoopes, the biographer of John Foster Dulles, has good reason for writing of the ex-US State Secretary's "moral ecstasy" on foreign policy issues. It was typical of Dulles, Hoopes says, to transform "every difference with the Soviet Union into a moral issue"<sup>2</sup> and it was therefore only natural that he took this same "moralising" approach to the non-aligned movement as well. His well-known thesis that non-aligned positions are "unethical" in conditions of struggle and competition between the two world systems became the basis both for the USA's general attitude to countries of that orientation and for specific political actions: refusal to aid Egypt in building the Aswan Dam, refusal to help India to build a heavy industry, the particularly fierce attacks on Indonesia, including aid to anti-government elements, and the general line against countries of Asia and Africa following their 1955 Bandung meeting, which adopted the first documents proclaiming the newly-independent countries' right "freely to choose their own political and economic systems and their own way of life in

<sup>1</sup> Seymour Deitchman, former director of the Pentagon's "counter-insurgency" programme, calculates that at the end of the 1960s the USA had 47 such "commitments" which placed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in a dependent position. (S. Deitchman, *Limited War and American Defense Policy*, Second Edition, Revised, The MIT Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England, 1969, pp. 56-57).

<sup>2</sup> Townsend Hoopes, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations".<sup>1</sup>

Summing up US policy toward the non-aligned movement during that period, progressive Indian publicist Hari Jaisingh writes: "It was in the context of this anti-Communist hysteria in the USA, led by Senator Joseph McCarthy, that nationalism of the newly-independent countries, with its anti-imperialist stance, came to be identified with communism. No one in America, not even Eisenhower, dared challenge these new forces of the ultras in America and everyone took cover under some anti-communist organization."<sup>2</sup>

It must be admitted that this policy of Washington's did much harm to the non-aligned movement. This was manifested, first of all, in the fact that its organisational formation slowed down considerably. A great deal of time passed after the Indian government proclaimed the non-aligned slogans before the liberated countries of Asia and Africa were able to agree on the Bandung meeting and try to formulate their own attitude to such urgent questions as peace and disarmament, completion of the decolonisation process, and the establishment of mutually advantageous cooperation. But, threatened with economic and diplomatic sanctions from the USA, even at that meeting the participating countries outlined only the most general ideas on their own foreign policy orientation. The organisational formation of the movement as such dragged on until 1961 when the world political situation finally allowed the founding countries to convene their first conference.

The early 1960s saw a new stage in the USA's relations with the countries of a neutralist orientation. By that time some aspects of the US position required a review of an openly negative policy toward non-aligned concepts and slogans and a search for new approaches.

This was above all connected with the general changes in the world correlation of forces. During the 1950s, the defence potential of the Soviet Union and other socialist

<sup>1</sup> *Non-Aligned Conferences: Basic Documents 1961-1965*, Compiled and Published by Bandaranaike Centre for International Studies, Colombo, 1976, P. V.

<sup>2</sup> Hari Jaisingh, *India and the Non-Aligned World. Search for a New Order*, Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd., 1983, p. 56.

countries strengthened substantially; the Soviet army acquired powerful nuclear delivery vehicles which did away with the strategic "invulnerability" of the territory of the USA itself and cast doubt on the value of the military bases and blocs that were being created around the territory of the USSR and other socialist countries. Also brought into question was the value of the US bloc strategy in the newly-independent countries and, in consequence, the policy of confrontation with the non-aligned movement. Arthur Schlesinger, one of Kennedy's closest aides, wrote about that period in US policy that "...we stopped regarding neutralism as a sin" (Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days. John F. Kennedy in the White House*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1965, p. 609.)

In addition, US allies among the former mother countries did not support Washington's efforts to combat the non-aligned movement. By that time colonialism's main battles had ended with its defeat (except for France's war in Algeria) and the former mother countries faced the problem of maintaining their influence in the ex-colonies. In this sense the non-aligned movement was not a great obstacle for them; on the contrary, in a number of cases the countries supporting this concept refrained from too close an association with the USA, making easier the former mother countries' fight to maintain their own positions.

Finally, obvious sympathy for non-alignment was growing among the young countries themselves, many of which, having gained independence toward the end of the 1950s and at the beginning of 1960s, immediately and unequivocally voiced support for non-alignment with military blocs and groups. The influence of these ideas began to carry great political weight and therefore required a more careful approach.

The first non-aligned conference, held in 1961 in Belgrade, provided clear evidence that the many years of US efforts to subvert the non-aligned movement had not prevented it from maintaining and even increasing its strength. The holding of the conference was also an important factor that pushed the Kennedy Administration to review some aspects of Washington's anti-neutralist policy.

For Kennedy and his supporters it was obvious that in

the modern world the non-aligned movement is largely objective in character. They regarded it principally as a desire on the part of the young countries to be "equidistant" from the two world systems and not to be involved in their conflicts in the world arena. They saw the roots of this policy in the pragmatic philosophy of some leaders of emergent states who sought to obtain foreign aid from both capitalist and socialist states, and therefore did not consider it as a serious "challenge" to US global pretensions.

On the contrary, banking on the use of various reformist methods in relations to the developing countries and on increased American aid to them (following the 1961 passage of the law on international development aid), Kennedy believed that he could keep the non-aligned states interested in maintaining "good" relations with the USA and thereby attain greater results than his predecessors, who had continued confrontation with the non-aligned countries. Such was the essence of his administration's approach to the non-aligned movement.

The Kennedy Administration made definite efforts to implement this approach. First, US aid to young countries was hiked to \$2 billion annually, and aid to such countries as India and Indonesia was also increased. Second, diplomatic efforts were made to repair relations between the USA and the most influential non-aligned countries—Egypt and India. Third, anti-neutralist rhetoric was removed from official documents, which started positively to assess the non-aligned movement.

But the period of relative "calm" in the USA's fight against the non-aligned movement was not a long one, and this showed yet again that President Kennedy's attitude to the movement was not popular in US political circles or even in the Democratic party. Following Kennedy's assassination on 22 November 1963, the policy pursued by his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, differed sharply from one of "reconciliation" with non-aligned countries.

First, the US launched an aggressive war in Indo-China, rousing the indignation of the whole world, including the non-aligned countries. This sparked a serious conflict between the USA and India, Egypt and Indonesia—the leading non-aligned countries. Second, the United States was extremely displeased at the results of the second non-aligned

summit, which deplored imperialism's intervention in Indo-China, the Congo and Cyprus, and opposed the deployment of foreign troops on the territory of other countries "against the expressed will of those countries."<sup>1</sup> Third, the United States welcomed the coups in Indonesia (1965) and Ghana (1966), which weakened the movement as a whole in that period; and Washington backed Pakistan in its war against India in 1965.

Of the greatest significance in the American opposition to the non-aligned movement at that time was the all-round US support for Israel's aggressive war against neighbouring Arab states in June 1967. Egypt took over as chairman of the movement following the second summit conference and Washington's support for the Israeli aggression against a country in that position was justly regarded by all member countries as a threat against them.

On the whole, the movement suffered considerable damage as a result of US imperialism's subversive policy in the second half of the 1960s, which slowed it down and hampered its organisational formation. The convening of regular non-aligned summit was postponed until 1970. The movement's leading countries were either having to pay primary attention to their defence (India, Egypt, Syria) or were experiencing a stage of severe domestic trials (Ghana, Indonesia). But on the whole imperialism's subversive policy was not successful even at that stage for the non-aligned movement continued to develop and strengthen.

Toward the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s the international situation was greatly altered by the achievement of approximate parity in the strategic potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States, and by the defeat of the American intervention in Indo-China. Above all these events created the prerequisites for a new upsurge in the struggle for detente, for strengthening international peace and security.

These events were also very important for the young independent countries. The shameful defeat of the American aggression in Vietnam could not but affect the situation in those countries. Many people believe that in Vietnam the USA was trying to teach the entire national liberation move-

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 24.

ment a lesson, to demonstrate its strength and toughness, and convince the non-aligned countries of the need to follow in the wake of American policy. "Vietnam," writes one radical American historian, "was the first serious American effort to relate militarily to the dominant political and social probabilities of the remainder of this century: the graduation of the poor, neocolonial states to a dynamic stage of development via revolutionary nationalist movements dedicated to combating stagnation and misery."<sup>1</sup>

In this sense the failure of the US intervention in Vietnam drew a broad response in the developing world. Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America clearly felt the effects of the changing balance of world forces and understood that US imperialism's possibilities in combating the national liberation movement are not unlimited, and that they had the backing of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which are prepared to render all-round assistance and support in their struggle for their legitimate national interests.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the non-aligned movement gained much from these changes in the international arena. While the heightened international tension and the escalation of US intervention in Indo-China had somewhat slowed down the growth and organisational activity of the movement in the second half of the 1960s (the second non-aligned summit was attended by 46 member countries and 10 observers, and the third by 54 members and 9 observers), the picture changed in the first half of the 1970s. The fourth conference was attended by 75 member countries and 8 observers.

There is no doubt whatsoever that American imperialism's defeat in Vietnam increased sympathy for the non-aligned movement still further and led to a considerable step up in the activity of the movement itself and its transition to the elaboration of serious and long-term programmes of struggle to strengthen the young states' independence and defend their economic interests. But of even greater importance was the development of the detente processes.

In a word, the decisive changes in the world correlation of forces in the early 1970s created favourable conditions

<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Kolko, *The Roots of American Foreign Policy. An Analysis of Power and Purpose*, Beacon Press: Boston, 1969, p. XV.



for invigoration of the non-aligned movement in its fight against imperialism's subversive activity. And the non-aligned countries lost no time in making use of these conditions to expand non-aligned membership (to 95 countries and organisations at the time of the fourth summit in 1979), step up their organisational work, and tackle the urgent political and economic problems of the young independent states.

How did the imperialist states react to these events? Their reaction was complex yet simple.

For the obvious reasons connected with its defeat in Vietnam, the actions of non-aligned states came as an unpleasant surprise for the American Administration, which was trying to keep a low profile in the developing countries (as evidenced by President Nixon's foreign policy "doctrine" of 1969-1972). In an effort to justify their forced decision to pull the American troops out of Indo-China, both president Nixon and his national security adviser Henry Kissinger constantly reiterated that the earlier administrations had "overated" the significance of the developing countries in American foreign policy, and that their real international political role was "decreasing" and that in the world of Realpolitik there was no point in taking into consideration such "amorphous" notions as the non-aligned movement.

As it turned out, this administration made a grave error in underestimating the role of the non-aligned movement in the modern world and ignoring it as a foreign policy factor.

Between 1974 and 1975 when the non-aligned countries launched a resolute offensive in the struggle for their rights, it was precisely this error which prompted the Ford Administration to introduce the so-called "link-up" foreign policy. Unable to oppose the developing states' legitimate demands, the American Administration declared that their actions were simply a result of Soviet "subversion" and tried to make of the Soviet Union the absolutely absurd and unjustified demands that it end support for the liberation movements (on the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, in southern Africa, and in the Middle East) since they were not in keeping with the "spirit of detente".

The greater role of anti-Sovietism in US policy toward

the non-aligned movement stemmed logically from Washington's general position at that time. The US government had committed an obvious error in underestimating the importance of the movement and allowing itself to be taken by surprise when that movement made firm demands for a review of the entire system of economic relations between developing countries and the developed capitalist powers. And in order to get out of this situation, which it had created of its own accord and which evoked only criticism and doubt both in the developing countries and among its own allies in the developed capitalist countries, the US government deemed it possible to begin to undermine the policy of detente by trying to blame its own blunders on Soviet "subversion". This naturally worsened Soviet-American relations and relations between the USA and non-aligned countries.

A definite attempt was made during the first years of the Carter Administration (1977-1980) to review the entire US policy toward the non-aligned movement. The administration's initial position was similar to that of John Kennedy. Carter tried to mend relations with India and normalise American-Cuban relations somewhat, and visited Nigeria and some other non-aligned countries. Washington again removed negative assessments of the non-aligned movement from the official rhetoric. Economic aid to a number of non-aligned states was increased on the basis of the law on international development aid passed in 1978 by the US Congress.

But these US government measures were a mere facade hiding the development of diametrically opposite processes. Unlike the Kennedy Administration, the Carter team had to deal with a non-aligned movement that had already been formed and was organisationally strong. The secret of its attitude to the movement was revealed by Roger Hansen, a former staff member of the National Security Council under Carter and a professor of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. In summer of 1980 he gave an analysis of the administration's policy in the American magazine *Foreign Affairs*.

First, Hansen pointed out that the young states—"as a whole and in various constituent groups—represent a diplomatic entity capable of independent actions which can

significantly influence ... U.S. foreign policy objectives.”<sup>1</sup> Second, he highlighted such an important aspect of the independent countries’ policy as collective diplomacy (he calls it “bloc” diplomatic activity), which in his view, is a “challenge to effective U.S. foreign policy formulation in the coming decade”.<sup>2</sup> Hansen links both aspects of the problem, that face American foreign policy, with the greater activity of the non-aligned movement, which he regards as the cementing force of the unity of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the struggle for their economic and political interests.

The Carter Administration was fully aware of this significance of the movement; therefore its course of opposition to and maneuvering toward the national liberation movement was marked by certain aspects which led to conflict with non-aligned countries.

Politically, US opposition to the non-aligned movement boiled over into fierce attacks by the administration on Cuba, which was to become movement chairman following the fourth non-aligned summit in Havana in 1979. On the whole Washington’s policy remained unchanged despite a certain normalisation of American-Cuban relations in 1977. By 1978 these relations were again aggravated by the anti-Cuban campaign launched by the American government over Cuba’s fraternal assistance to the people of Ethiopia in resisting Somali aggression. In 1979 a crisis arose in the relations as a result of Washington’s false claims that a “Soviet military brigade” had been stationed in Cuba.

Moderate American analysts had noted as early as the year before that the worsening of American-Cuban relations was largely connected with Cuba’s increasingly prominent place in the non-aligned movement. Both President Carter and his staff members claimed that Cuba could not head the non-aligned movement since it is an “ally” of the USSR. At the same time pressure was brought to bear on other non-aligned countries under the pretext that the holding of the conference in Havana and Cuba’s chairmanship would undermine the movement from within.<sup>3</sup>

Economically, US pressure on the non-aligned countries

<sup>1</sup> *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 58, No. 5, Summer 1980, p. 1104.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1106.

<sup>3</sup> See: *International Bulletin (Berkeley)*, Vol. V, No. 13, 3 July 1978, p. 4.

became particularly obvious. In 1977 the Carter Administration made efforts to minimise the results of the "North-South dialogue" held in Paris at the conference on international economic cooperation. It later elaborated its "special" approach to aid to the independent countries. According to this approach they were divided into several groups: "poor" and relatively "rich" countries. Accordingly, the former were given insignificant "charitable" aid for the population's "basic needs", while the latter received "commercial" aid made up largely of state and private credits, which considerably increased their indebtedness to American banks.

The US Administration did not scruple to make direct use of economic levers to pressure non-aligned countries. For example, during his January 1978 visit to India President Carter ordered the diplomatic service to prepare a special message to the Indian government threatening to halt supplies of concentrated uranium from the USA for the Tarapur atomic station in India if Delhi did not make political concessions. Economic levers were also used to encourage the separatist deals between Egypt and Israel, and also to secure support for them on the part of Jordan, Lebanon and other Arab states.

In US social policy with respect to the non-aligned countries, the Carter Administration invented the human rights campaign. First, under the pretext of "human rights violations", the administration stopped aid to countries of socialist orientation—Mozambique and Ethiopia, and got international financial institutions to halt aid to those countries and also to Vietnam, Laos, Cuba and Angola. Second, on the basis of the 1978 law on international development aid, the administration used its assessment of the "human rights record" as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of non-aligned countries by threatening to end or reduce American aid.

On the whole the aggravation of relations between the USA and the non-aligned movement during the Carter Administration is quite explainable. From 1973 onward (since the conference in Algeria) the movement scored major successes: a programme of struggle for a new international economic order was adopted, movement membership rose and its organisational bases were strengthened, and anti-im-

perialist and anti-neocolonialist slogans were increasingly advanced. The disbandment of the SEATO bloc in 1977 and the self-liquidation of the SENTO bloc in 1979 following the successful anti-shah revolution in Iran were particularly severe blows for the American Administration. And the revolution in Iran, which ended the despotic regime of a notable US ally, also did great damage to the American neo-colonial "empire".

In this context Washington stepped up its subversion of the movement immeasurably in the early 1980s. Not content with its own measures in this area, the American Administration tried to involve its NATO allies and other international forces more actively in combating the non-aligned movement. Using the meetings of the seven major capitalist powers, the American Administration imposed its approach on them in economic relations with non-aligned countries. This applied above all to the problem of their debts to the capitalist world and the financing of their development programmes by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The advent of the Reagan Administration in the USA in 1981 brought an even sharper rightward turn in Washington's foreign policy. And in the final year of the previous administration the White House had, on the basis of the January 1980 "Carter doctrine", taken a series of measures that heightened international tension. The new administration went much further: plans were announced to increase military spending substantially, deploy new strategic systems, expand US military presence abroad, and step up the propaganda offensive against the world of socialism. Soviet-American relations were under fierce attacks by the administration, which wanted American "superiority" and "leadership" throughout the world.

There were a number of reasons why the Reagan Administration needed to link anti-Sovietism and the fight against the national liberation movement. On the one hand, the emphasis on the Soviet Union's supposed "destabilising" role in the developing countries was an attempt by the administration to enflame anti-Soviet sentiments in other developed capitalist countries that are dependent on resources from Asia, Africa and Latin America, to sow distrust to ward Soviet policy in the developing countries them-

selves, and strengthen tendencies toward closer relations with the USA and opposed to friendly relations with the socialist countries, thereby depriving the developing states of powerful support in protecting their legitimate interests.

On the other hand, the administration hoped thereby to diminish the significance of the non-aligned countries' independent initiatives. Claiming, contrary to the facts, that the "third world" is unable to make independent collective efforts to defend its own interests, the American Administration ascribed the young states' anti-imperialism and desire to defend their interests to the "intrigues" of the USSR and its "agents".

The administration took an irreconcilably hostile stance toward the movement and set itself the task of helping as many Asian, African and Latin American countries as possible to "get rid of the fetters of neutralism". The American Administration's opposition to the non-aligned movement included the military, diplomatic, economic and propaganda spheres of US foreign policy.

In the military area, under the pretext of opposing the USSR the American Administration aimed considerably to heighten the military threat to non-aligned countries, thereby getting them to yield to US pressure. The first to outline this idea was Henry Kissinger, who during a Middle East trip made on Reagan's instruction, declared that "the permanent US military presence (in developing countries—*Author*) would supplant the concept of a US Rapid Deployment Force embraced by the Carter Administration".<sup>1</sup> But Kissinger was wrong about one thing: the Reagan Administration's military strategy in the developing countries did not replace the rapid deployment force concept (on the contrary, its size increased from 110,000 to 300,000 men under Reagan) but rather supplemented it with the permanent presence concept.

US armed forces in Central America and the Caribbean and the Middle East were increased, and a US armed forces central command (CENTCOM) was created and 19 Indian Ocean states arbitrarily included in its sphere of operation. Although the pretext given for these military preparations was the need to "stabilise" those regions they were intended

<sup>1</sup> *The Washington Post*, 7 January 1981, p. A15.

as a permanent military threat to the independent states, as evidenced by the American intervention in Grenada in October 1983, which did away with the independence of that non-aligned state. Cuba, Libya and Syria have been subjected to constant US military threats.

Along with direct military preparations, the American Administration has also substantially stepped up various veiled forms of pressure and the use of "other hands", i.e. American allies and "friendly" regimes. Afghanistan and Nicaragua have been especially pressured by US-financed mercenaries. South Africa and Israel have carried out armed operations against neighbouring independent states with the blessing of the administration.

The American Administration uses various forms of state terrorism to bring military pressure to bear on non-aligned countries: the threat of direct aggression and intervention, payment of mercenaries and armed bands, encouragement of terrorist groups inside independent states, and support for the aggressive actions of its allies and "friends". Under the Reagan Administration US state terrorism has become one of the most common means of armed opposition to the non-aligned movement and this administration has gone much further than all previous American Administrations.

The Reagan Administration's diplomacy, also makes use of all available channels for combating the non-aligned movement. The noisy and provocative anti-Cuban campaign launched by the administration as soon as it took office aimed not only to pressure Cuba but also to isolate it in the non-aligned movement. The Reagan Administration tried to portray socialist Cuba as a "centre of international terrorism" so as to sow distrust toward its policy among other non-aligned countries and play up the movement's objective difficulties, thereby discrediting its leadership.

A high point in the USA's diplomatic fight against the movement under the Reagan Administration was its attempt to frustrate the convocation of the seventh and eighth summits in Delhi and Harare. When that failed, Washington tried to influence the conduct of the very conferences and the drafting of their documents in a direction that suited the USA. To that end it attempted through a number of countries close to the USA to get the conference to focus

on the so-called Afghan and Kampuchean issues so as to whip up anti-Soviet and anti-Vietnamese sentiments among the conference participants.

These attempts failed. Far from supporting the attempts to thwart discussion of the movement's pressing problems under the pretext of the need to discuss the above-mentioned issues, most countries urged the adoption of documents condemning the US policy of combating the national liberation movement and the young independent countries' legitimate desire to review their unequal economic relations with the West. Evidence of Washington's failure was the angry 15 March 1983 US State Department release, mentioned in the previous chapter, calling the seventh conference declaration "an unbalanced and polemical document which does not reflect the principles of non-alignment".

In the area of economic relations with non-aligned countries the Reagan Administration has taken a tough and uncompromising position. Those countries have repeatedly tried to set out their claims against the developed capitalist countries on economic matters: at the October 1981 meeting in Cancún (Mexico), at UN General Assembly sessions, and during the meetings of the "big seven" developed capitalist countries in Williamsburg (1983) and London (1984).

But Washington continues to ignore all the demands of those countries. As was shown in previous chapters, the Reagan Administration's economic strategy is one of strengthening TNCs positions in the economy of the developing countries and using their indebtedness for both political and economic ends.

There has also been an aggravation of the conflict between the USA and the non-aligned movement in the area of ideology and propaganda. The Reagan Administration's forthright opposition to the movement could not but worsen the situation in the area of ideology and propaganda, though in earlier years American leaders preferred to maintain a semblance of "respect" for the ideals of non-alignment. But under Reagan, when the USA started directly to link its opposition to the movement with anti-Sovietism, in a number of cases the administration, too, did not conceal its annoyance with non-aligned countries and the struggle in the area of ideas and propaganda came to the surface.



The American administration had a vast arsenal in this area: while avoiding Dulles's formulations, administration officials accused the movement of "departing from non-aligned principles" (this referred both to Cuba's role in the movement and the content of its basic documents) and of being "unbalanced" and "pro-Soviet". Individual countries were again accused of "human rights violations" (for example, the Indian government in its fight against the separatist and terrorist groups) and of "interference" in "private enterprise". Defending their interests against the "information imperialism" of the USA and other developed powers, the non-aligned countries were forced to press for a new international information order which would shield their population from the negative impact of hostile propaganda.

US Administration actions to undermine the non-aligned movement have had an effect. In a number of instances they have caused complications within the movement, especially when imperialism makes use of its agents among the membership. Washington has been able to secure a certain support for its actions by other developed capitalist powers, for example on economic issues and in bringing military pressure to bear on non-aligned countries. An important result of imperialism's anti-non-alignment policy has been the drastic aggravation of the conflicts in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, the north and south of Africa, South-east Asia, and Central America and the Caribbean.

Yet, in summing up this analysis of imperialism's subversion of the non-aligned movement it can be said that while imperialism has certainly done much harm to the movement and helped to aggravate a number of political, economic and social problems of member countries (a fact which those countries have not forgotten and which has led them to take measures to safeguard their sovereignty), it has not been able to crush the movement, reduce its role to one of resolving particular problems, or prevent it from developing friendly and mutually-advantageous relations with the world of socialism.

Despite imperialism's policy, the non-aligned movement has not only become an objective reality of international life but is increasingly involved in the search for solutions to questions affecting all humanity, for example, war and peace, disarmament, and mutually-advantageous coopera-

tion. Well-known Indian international relations expert K. Subrahmanyam wrote following the Delhi summit that non-aligned countries "represent humanity's urge to survive".<sup>1</sup>

And that makes the movement an objective ally of all forces that want to ensure humanity's future and combat a policy of war and exploitation. That is why the deepening conflict between imperialism and the non-aligned movement is not an anomaly in the policy of this or that US Administration, of this or that capitalist state, but an objective law-governed phenomenon which is increasingly obvious with each passing year and is a source of irritation in the world of imperialism. The imperialist powers may change their tactics, methods and means of combating the movement but their strategy in principle cannot change for the non-aligned movement is a result of the peoples' worldwide struggle for freedom and independence.

<sup>1</sup> *The Times of India*, 17 March 1983, p. 9.

### **Socialist Countries and the Non-Aligned Movement**

The position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states with respect to the non-aligned movement is determined by their general principled political line toward the anti-imperialist national liberation movement, and toward the developing countries that have rid themselves of colonial domination. This position is one of strengthening the alliance of world socialism with the national liberation movement, above all strengthening cooperation between the socialist community and the non-aligned movement.

The USSR has always rendered all-round assistance to the national liberation forces. It is no exaggeration to say that in the last years no country or people waging struggle against imperialism and for national liberation has been denied the material, moral and political support of the Soviet Union. Clear examples of this over the last decade were the aid to the Vietnamese people in their liberation struggle against the aggression of US imperialism, and the support for the liberation struggle of the peoples of Laos and Kampuchea, Angola and Ethiopia, Bangladesh and Yemen, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique, Afghanistan and Nicaragua.

Along with the other progressive forces, the Soviet Union hailed the proclamation of Zimbabwean independence, which crowned the many years of heroic struggle by the people of that country against the colonial racist regime. The Soviet Union is in solidarity with the just struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence, and with the people of South Africa, who are fighting against the regime of racial oppression.

When the USA supplied Angolan counter-revolutionary organisations with arms, organisations whose armed contingents were operating in league with South African troops,

the USSR, in response to a request from the Angolan government, gave assistance to the armed forces of the young republic, enabling Angola, backed by socialist Cuba, to rout the South African troops and counter-revolutionary bands and uphold its independence.

Following the 1978 Iranian revolution, Washington made no secret of its intention to crush that revolution at any cost, threatened armed intervention and even carried out armed raids against Iranian territory. Guided by the universally recognised norms of international law and the principles of inter-state relations, the Soviet Union warned the US government of the grave consequences which could ensue from any attempt to bring American troops onto Iranian territory, and Washington was forced to retreat.

Soviet support for the progressive regimes in Ethiopia and Benin enabled them to thwart the attempts to export counter-revolution to those countries soon after the anti-imperialist and national democratic revolutions there.

The very existence of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries limits the imperialists' possibilities of dictating their will to the liberated countries and using military force for those ends.

When it became clear that economic, political and diplomatic forms of aid from the USSR to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan were insufficient, and when revolutionary power in Afghanistan was in immediate danger, the Soviet Union, in response to a request from the DRA government, brought a limited contingent of its troops into Afghanistan to help the Afghan people repel the armed aggression.

The past ten years have seen the completion, in the main, of the liquidation of the colonial regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The loss of its colonies has greatly reduced imperialism's sphere of influence both territorially and politically. This has meant a new stage in the relations between the emergent states and the main capitalist countries and a further weakening of the latter's political and economic positions, and has given rise to new forms of struggle against imperialism.

The non-aligned movement is presently the principal anti-imperialist association of the forces for national liberation at the inter-state level and on a global scale. The appearance,

development and strengthening of this international association was possible only against the background of the new world balance of forces favouring socialism, the growth and strengthening of the forces of world socialism and the national liberation movement, the increase in the number of countries of socialist orientation, and the deepening crisis of the world capitalist system.

The Soviet Union develops relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with the peoples of all continents that have cast off the fetters of the colonial yoke and are fighting against imperialism and colonialism and for stronger independence, a progressive path of social development, and liberation from continuing exploitation by imperialism.

Rejecting on principle any interference in the internal affairs of the young national states, the Soviet Union deems it its internationalist duty to assist the peoples in their anti-imperialist struggle.

The political and legal contractual basis for the political cooperation between non-aligned states and socialist countries is formed by the treaties and declarations on friendship and cooperation signed in the past few years between the USSR and India (August 1971), Iraq (April 1972), São Tome and Principe (October 1976), Angola (October 1976), Mozambique (March 1977), Afghanistan (October 1978), Ethiopia (November 1978), Vietnam (November 1978), the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (October 1979), Syria (October 1980), the Congo (May 1981), and the Yemen Arab Republic (October 1984).

It is significant that the Soviet Union is the only great power to have undertaken, under the forementioned treaties, to respect the policy of non-alignment and to regard it as an important factor in the maintenance of international peace and security. Article 3 of the 20 November 1978 Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and Socialist Ethiopia says that the Soviet Union respects socialist Ethiopia's policy, which is based on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity and the non-aligned movement and is an important factor in the development of international cooperation and peaceful co-existence, while the Soviet-Indian treaty states that non-alignment is an important factor in the mainten-

ance of universal peace and international security and in an easing of world tension. Article 5 of the 5 December 1978 Treaty on Friendship, Goodneighbourliness and Cooperation between the USSR and the DRA says that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respects the policy of non-alignment pursued by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, a policy which is an important factor in the maintenance of international peace and security.

In the main the interests, goals and positions of the USSR and the other socialist community countries coincide with those of non-aligned countries on such questions as detente, disarmament, removal of the seats of military conflict, greater security in various regions, particularly in Asia, liquidation of the imperialist military bases and withdrawal of the troops of the imperialist states from the territory of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, disbandment of the aggressive imperialist military blocs, strengthening of the national liberation movement, elimination of the last bastion of colonialism, etc. Evidence of this is provided by the decisions of all non-aligned summits, which show that the world socialist system and the non-aligned movement face a series of common problems and tasks connected with opposing imperialism's aggressive policy, finally liquidating the vestiges of colonialism, restructuring the unequal and discriminatory system of international economic ties, and combating racism, Zionism, national chauvinism and hegemonism. The peoples of both groups of countries have a vital interest in strengthening peace and international security, removing the danger of a new world war, enhancing international detente, disbanding the military blocs, effecting early disarmament, establishing equitable mutually-advantageous cooperation, etc.

The Soviet Union welcomed the first non-aligned summit in 1961 and expressed support for the movement's just aspirations in its message: "We know that, along with other peoples, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who used to be bound by colonial chains but have awakened and have squared their powerful shoulders, are raising their voice in favour of peace, national independence and freedom," said the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers in a message to the chairman of the non-aligned conference.

The Soviet Union's policy toward the non-aligned move-

ment is clear and consistent. It has often declared its support for the movement's basic policy directions.

The message of greeting from the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers to the seventh non-aligned conference in March 1983 said that "there has always been fervent support in the Soviet Union for the non-aligned movement's efforts in the struggle for peace and security of the peoples, for an end to the arms race and for disarmament, for a restructuring of international economic relations on just democratic bases, and for full and all-round decolonisation".

In his 1986 message to R. Mugabe, Chairman of the eighth summit conference, Michail Gorbachev said: "We see the non-aligned movement as a powerful force opposing war and aggression, imperialism, colonialism and racism. We properly value the readiness of non-aligned countries to assume their share of high responsibility for the destinies of mankind."<sup>1</sup>

The Soviet government has repeatedly stated that an easing of international tension and a peaceful settlement of world problems are impossible without the active participation on an equal basis of all states, including non-aligned members.

The USSR's message to the non-aligned countries on the 20th anniversary of the movement noted that the development of friendship and cooperation with non-aligned countries, which are an important part of the peoples' front of struggle for peace and freedom, has always been a principled position of the Soviet Union.

The other socialist community countries take the same stance. All of them have treaties on friendship and cooperation with non-aligned members. The German Democratic Republic has treaties with the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Ethiopia. Czechoslovakia has treaties with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia, the People's Republic of Angola and Libya. Poland has a treaty with Ethiopia, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic Republic

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 9 September 1986.

of Afghanistan, and so on.

It is important to underscore that these international documents formalise the equal political, economic and other relations between socialist community countries and non-aligned states on the basis of agreed principles which accord with the national interests of the contracting countries and their common tasks in the struggle for universal peace, international security, and the freedom and independence of the peoples.

As a rule, these documents stress the importance of relations of friendship, all-round cooperation, respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. They express readiness to cooperate closely and in an all-round way to ensure conditions for preserving and further developing the peoples' socio-economic gains, and respecting each contracting country's sovereignty over its natural resources.

These treaties have no aggressive goals nor are they aimed against any other country. Far from signifying a member country's renunciation of non-alignment, they confirm its adherence to that policy and at the same time reflect the socialist community countries' respect for the non-aligned movement.

The high and positive assessment of the non-aligned movement contained in these international treaties, which are signed by socialist community countries, undoubtedly enhance the movement's prestige in the world arena and give it a greater role in resolving international problems.

Relations between socialist community and non-aligned countries are an embodiment of the relations which non-aligned states believe should exist between all states of the world.

The high regard for the non-aligned movement and the line of the socialist community states toward strengthening cooperation with the movement are reflected in policy documents of the supreme forums of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation—meetings of the Political Consultative Committee.

The declaration entitled "For the Further Advancement of Detente and for the Consolidation of Security and the Development of Cooperation in Europe", which was adopted at the 26 November 1976 Bucharest meeting of the



Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, stated: "It is noted with gratification that the developing Afro-Asian and Latin American countries play an ever greater role in world affairs. The fifth non-aligned summit in Colombo reaffirmed their positive role in international life. The states represented at the meeting firmly intend to cement cooperation with these countries in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, for strengthening national independence, peace and social progress."<sup>1</sup>

Two years later, on 23 November 1978, in a declaration passed by the Political Consultative Committee in Moscow, the Warsaw Treaty members deemed it necessary to outline their position on the liberated countries, taking account of the fundamental principles and tasks of the non-aligned movement. The declaration says that with respect to the liberated countries the Warsaw Treaty participating states strictly adhere to the principles of equality, mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, and cooperation. "In no areas of the world are socialist countries seeking any privileges for themselves, pressing for military bases or hunting for concessions. Coming out in principle against the imperialist policy of creating spheres of influence, they never take part in the struggle for such spheres," said the declaration.<sup>2</sup>

Shortly after the sixth non-aligned summit in Havana, a Warsaw Treaty declaration of 16 May 1980 welcomed the heightened role in the resolution of complex international problems played by the non-aligned movement, which is an important positive factor in present-day international politics. The results of the summit were assessed in the same spirit, the Warsaw Treaty countries expressing support for its decisions, which aimed to strengthen peace and international security, effect disarmament, create zones of peace, liquidate military bases on foreign territory, prevent any interference in states' internal affairs, ensure the peoples' rights to free and independent development, liberate Asia, Africa and Latin America from imperialist, colonial and

<sup>1</sup> *Moscow News*, Supplement to issue No. 49 (2725), 1976, pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Moscow News*, Supplement to issue No. 48 (2828), 1978, p. 6.

neocolonial exploitation, and establish a new international economic order on a just and democratic basis.<sup>1</sup>

The December 1980 Warsaw Treaty summit firmly reiterated member countries' desire to cooperate with all progressive anti-imperialist and democratic forces and strengthen the solidarity of all peoples in the struggle against the war danger, for a policy of peace, disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament, detente and equal cooperation. The meeting expressed its conviction that the pooled efforts of all countries and peoples that want peace, security and international cooperation can make detente the leading tendency of international development.

The friendly attitude of the Warsaw Treaty states to the non-aligned movement was also reflected in their January 1983 Political Declaration, which said: "A growing contribution to the liquidation and prevention of crises is being made by the non-aligned movement, whose practical steps in this direction should be recognised and supported by all states."<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the fullest expression of the socialist community countries' position with respect to the non-aligned movement is to be found in the declaration entitled "Preservation of Peace and International Economic Cooperation" adopted at the 14 June 1984 CMEA economic summit: "Noting with satisfaction the increased significance of the non-aligned countries as a powerful factor of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism—the forces of war and aggression—and the efforts made in this directions following the sixth non-aligned summit in Havana, the meeting expresses its solidarity with the decisions and message of the seventh conference of heads of state or government of non-aligned countries in Delhi, which aim to resolve the fundamental problems of our day: the struggle for universal peace, peaceful co-existence, disarmament, national independence, and the economic and social development of each country."<sup>3</sup>

In its turn, the 1986 meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee made note of the movement's growing role in world affairs and expressed the hope that

<sup>1</sup> *New Times*, Moscow, No. 21, May 1980, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, 7 January 1983.

<sup>3</sup> *New Times*, Moscow, No. 21, May 1980, p. 30.

the Harare conference would "promote peace and international security".<sup>1</sup>

The strengthening of cooperation between the two groups of states is no doubt facilitated by their common or similar approach to a number of international problems. And this despite the existence of Warsaw Treaty Organisation. It is common knowledge that the creation of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation in 1955 as a defensive military and political alliance of the socialist states was a forced response to the 1949 creation of the imperialist powers' aggressive NATO bloc. It is also well known that the Warsaw Treaty member states suggested on various occasions that both military and political unions be disbanded and that when that proposal was not supported they proposed, as a first step, that the military organisations of both alliances be liquidated. When that proposal, too, was not accepted, the Warsaw Treaty advanced the idea of limiting the blocs' military activity and stated that it would not expand the sphere of its activity to other regions of the world.

Unlike the imperialist powers, the Soviet Union has never tried, nor does it intend to try, to draw non-aligned countries into any military and political blocs and groups, and has never carried out, nor does it intend to carry out, any aggression against non-aligned countries or to threaten them with force. The imperialist plans to set up new closed military and political groups in various regions, specifically in Southeast Asia, West Africa, the Red Sea, etc., is the reason for the socialist and developing countries to combat even more actively expansion of existing and establishment of new closed military and political groups and alliances, in particular to fight for non-expansion of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, liquidation of their military organisations and simultaneous disbandment of the alliances so as to surmount the division of the world into opposed blocs. This is in keeping with the goals of both the socialist community and the non-aligned movement.

The non-aligned movement and socialist community countries also have a common understanding of and approach to the question of the connection between peace and development.

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 12 June 1986.

The New Delhi Message adopted at the seventh summit expressly says: "Peace and peaceful co-existence, independence, disarmament and development are the central issues of our time."<sup>1</sup>

This non-aligned position on the profound connection between peace and development is shared by the socialist community. The CMEA declaration "Preservation of Peace and International Economic Cooperation", adopted in June 1984 in Moscow, says that member countries are "convinced that no world problems, including the historical competition between socialism and capitalism, can be solved militarily... An easing of the military danger would make it possible to increase economic aid to the newly-independent countries."

The Soviet Union, the other socialist community states and non-aligned countries jointly advocate disarmament measures: non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a ban on nuclear weapons and on nuclear weapon tests, arms reduction, the convening of a world disarmament conference, etc. Their common desire to achieve real progress toward disarmament has been demonstrated on more than one occasion at UN General Assembly sessions.

Such sessions provide impressive evidence of the solidarity between the Soviet Union, the other socialist community countries and non-aligned states. The Soviet peace initiatives are not merely supported by most non-aligned countries: socialist and non-aligned states sponsored a number of resolutions on disarmament at the 38th session, including the resolution entitled "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space", which was adopted by 147 votes, the USA being the only state to nay it.

The non-aligned movement and the socialist community are active proponents of liquidation of existing and prevention of new crises, the latter giving the former every support in this matter. A basis of the foreign policy of the fraternal socialist countries is solidarity with the peoples that have to repel attacks by the aggressive forces of imperialism, which creates very dangerous seats of bloody violence and military strife in different regions.

The US aggression against sovereign Grenada was strongly

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132*, p. 56.

condemned by socialist and non-aligned countries. A special session of the non-aligned countries' coordinating bureau in New York described the armed invasion of Grenada as a violation of international law and the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that state, and demanded an immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from the island.

Socialist and non-aligned countries are both concerned over the explosive situation in Central America and the Caribbean and regard the United States as the principal culprit. They are unswerving in their solidarity with Nicaragua in repelling imperialist aggression and intervention, and with the struggle of the Salvadoran patriots. Socialist and non-aligned countries want a peaceful settlement of the regional problems and welcome the efforts of the Contadora group.

Like the socialist states, the non-aligned movement urges an early end to the fratricidal Iran-Iraq war and opposes all attempts by imperialist circles to use the conflict as an excuse for large-scale military intervention in the Persian Gulf. The socialist countries support the non-aligned efforts to secure a peaceful end to the war.

For many years the Soviet Union has been giving effective aid to the Arab peoples' fight to eliminate the effects of the Israeli aggression and enhance the Arab states' military potential and is determined to continue to promote a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union is a consistent supporter of the Arab countries in their struggle for a comprehensive Middle East settlement based on a complete pullout of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and exercise of the inalienable national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state.

The socialist community supports the non-aligned position on a Middle East settlement. The seventh conference of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries approved the principles of such a settlement put forward by the Conference of the Arab Heads of State and Government in Fez. The same was also done by the Warsaw Treaty member states at the January 1983 Prague meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, whose political declaration expressed the conviction that "a comprehensive settle-

ment in the Middle East should provide for the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including the eastern part of Jerusalem; for recognition of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to establish their own independent state; ensuring the right of all the states in the region to independent existence and development; ending the state of war and establishing peace between the Arab states and Israel; for the drafting and adopting of international guarantees for a peaceful settlement".<sup>1</sup>

Persistent struggle against colonialism has been a very important direction of non-aligned activity throughout the movement's history. Here, too, the non-aligned countries have a reliable ally in the socialist countries. The Declaration of the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted in 1960 at the 15th UN General Assembly session exerted a tremendous influence on the process of liquidating the colonial empires. The fraternal socialist countries, the USSR above all, were instrumental in the adoption of this historic document.

The socialist countries are in solidarity with the non-aligned movement in their denunciation of racism, apartheid, and Zionism. Holding common positions with non-aligned countries, the socialist community gives political, diplomatic and material aid to the national liberation movements in southern Africa. It expresses its unfailing support for the Namibian people and SWAPO—their sole legitimate representative in the struggle for the full liberation of Namibia, rejecting the American linking of Namibian independence to a withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola, and demands immediate independence for Namibia in line with UN resolutions. Socialist and non-aligned countries resolutely condemn the Pretoria racists' policy of apartheid and their acts of aggression and subversion against Angola, Mozambique and other frontline states.

It is now obvious that effective measures are necessary to ensure peace on the Asian continent, whose many hot spots could become scenes of military conflicts. The USSR advocates pooled efforts to strengthen peace on the con-

<sup>1</sup> *Peace and Disarmament. Academic Studies 1984*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1985, p. 327.

tinient through the gradual development of mutually-advantageous and mutually-enriching ties and peaceful cooperation of all Asian states, and the basing of those relations on the principles of peaceful co-existence and strict respect for each state's sovereignty and independence proclaimed by Asian states in Bandung.

Because of US naval and air force concentration in the Persian Gulf and the resultant dangerous potential seat of military conflict, the Soviet Union strongly condemns the US attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the region's states, opposes the creation of military and political blocs and military bases there, and wants free navigation in the Persian Gulf. The doctrine of peace and security, proclaimed and followed by the USSR, is infused with an understanding of the vital interests of the Persian Gulf states and respect for their non-aligned status.

The Soviet Union proposes to the USA, other Western powers, China, Japan, and all interested states that agreement be reached on a number of mutual undertakings to strengthen peace in the region: not to set up foreign bases in the Persian Gulf zone or on adjacent islands; not to deploy nuclear or any other mass destruction weapons there; not to use or threaten to use force against Persian Gulf countries and not to interfere in their internal affairs; to respect the non-aligned status opted for by the Persian Gulf states; not to involve them in military groups that include nuclear powers; to respect the sovereignty of the region's states over their natural resources; and not to erect any obstacles or dangers to normal trade and the use of the sea lanes linking the region with other countries.

Along with the other socialist community countries, the USSR supports the proposal of the Indian Ocean states and the non-aligned movement to turn that region into a zone of peace, and has stated its readiness to cooperate in this endeavour.

As has already been noted, the USSR and the other socialist community states render much assistance to the developing countries and help them to develop their national economy, but this aid is not compensation for damage done; it is the aid of a friend and ally in the struggle against a common enemy—imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

The developing countries' share in the foreign trade of CMEA member countries has risen to 12%. In 1970s CMEA credits to those countries for economic and social development more than doubled. Goods from the developing countries enter the Soviet Union duty free, and similar measures have been taken by other socialist community states.

More than 3,000 projects have been built and commissioned by CMEA countries in non-aligned states, and there are agreements to construct a further 2,000.

The economic cooperation between socialist and liberated countries is not antagonistic and has an anti-imperialist content. These are truly economic relations between equals which offer increasing possibilities for trade, larger credits, the development of scientific and technical ties, etc. Unlike imperialist "aid", cooperation between socialist and non-aligned countries pursues no selfish ends but rather aims to develop the young states' economies, industrialise and modernise production, and overcome disproportions in the economy.

The further development of socialist economic integration makes it possible more fully to use this factor to aid developing countries.

The socialist community countries consistently support the non-aligned countries' fight for economic independence, complete sovereignty over their natural resources, and cardinal changes in the international division of labour, i.e. for changes that could bring about a new economic order on a democratic and just basis.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries regard these non-aligned demands as part and parcel of the global struggle against imperialism. Consistent in its efforts to improve the entire system of international economic relations and reorganise them on a democratic and just basis, the USSR stated at the 31st UN General Assembly session that in this area the vital interests of socialist and developing countries largely coincide.

The socialist community's support for the just economic demands of non-aligned states is not merely declarative. The June 1984 CMEA economic summit advanced a feasible action programme for improving international economic relations.

Because of the specific character of the economic develop-



ment and position of the USSR, differences in the approach to these problems are manifested in certain concrete questions of the methods, means, ways and priorities for carrying out this or that task. Naturally, with the common basic interests and goals of socialist and developing countries concerning the reorganisation of international economic relations, the existing particular differences and disagreements can be settled during their close cooperation through consultations and careful account of the interests and positions of each country.

The cooperation and joint actions by non-aligned and socialist countries meet not only the interests of all the countries in the world but also the vital interests of the non-aligned states themselves, and strengthen their positions in the struggle against imperialism and the creation of more favourable conditions for consolidating their independence and national development.

Experience has shown that the attainment of the main goals and implementation of the basic principles of non-alignment are largely dependent on the movement's readiness and ability to internationally cooperate with its true friends—the other progressive, peace-loving and democratic forces, the socialist community states first and foremost.

Such cooperation is especially important in the present international situation when it is necessary to invigorate all progressive and peace-loving forces to combat the aggressive policy of imperialism, which is trying to take the offensive against the forces of world socialism and the national liberation movement, tilt the military parity in its favour, and revenge its past defeats.

Only by acting together can the peace-loving states and peoples check the aggressive forces and turn the course of events from a whipping up of international tension to detente, from an aggravating of conflicts to their settlement and to the realisation of the principles of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems.

Of course, not all non-aligned positions are similar or close to those of the socialist community, and appreciable differences exist on some international issues. But that is not the main thing. The main thing is what unites them. The objective position of non-aligned countries in the world economy and world politics and their objective economic

and political interests bring them into conflict with the imperialist powers and closer to the socialist states on the principal questions of international economic and political relations.

As the positions of the non-aligned movement over the past three years have shown, the objective need to combat imperialism does not permit the movement to be "equidistant from the blocs" and to break with the world of socialism as the West would like it to do. Such a move would mean depriving it of support in the world arena and weakening its own forces and possibilities, and would benefit only its opponents in the camp of imperialism.

Objective developments in the world and the peace-promoting foreign policy of the USSR and the other socialist community countries, stepped-up US aggressiveness and adventurism and the deepening economic and political contradictions between the imperialist and developing countries have resulted in the gradual formation of a united front of socialist and non-aligned countries on the most important international political and economic problems, a front opposed to the forces of imperialism, colonialism, reaction and war.

### **The Non-Aligned Movement and International Organisations of Emergent States**

As a political association, the non-aligned movement co-operates not only with the UN but also with both inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations of the emergent states, and this is a new factor in the international arena.

In order to understand their cooperation, note should be made of several aspects of the movement's position with respect to the UN.

In September 1961 when the first non-aligned countries were officially institutionalised and associated, their number stood at 25, with one of them—Algeria—not yet a UN member. In other words, only 24% of the 99 UN members at that time were non-aligned countries. In 1973, at its fourth summit, the movement had 75 members, of which 73 (the Palestine Liberation Organisation and the Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam being the exceptions) were UN members. Thus, accounting for more than half of the 132 members at the 28th UN General Assembly session, which followed the fourth summit conference, the non-aligned countries not only advanced their first global initiative—the demand for a new international economic order—but got the session to agree to convene the sixth special General Assembly session on that question in 1974. That was but the first of several special and extraordinary special General Assembly sessions convened on the initiative of non-aligned countries, which now make up almost two-thirds of UN membership.

The non-aligned movement has always attached paramount importance to the UN. The increased non-aligned membership in the UN has greatly facilitated a collective goal of non-aligned members—maximum use of the UN mechanism to promote non-aligned objectives. The importance of this for the movement can be seen in the fact that

such non-aligned bodies as the Plenary Meeting and the Plenary Conference are directly connected with the UN headquarters by both venue and composition. It is also highly convenient for the above mentioned purpose that both Conferences and Meetings are usually held on the eve of the UN General Assembly session (the exception, for well-known reasons, being the 1983 Delhi summit). This makes it possible to prepare and determine precise positions before the regular session of this international organisation.

In its turn, the approach of the international organisations of the emergent countries to the UN and to the non-aligned movement itself is reflected in this attitude of the movement to the UN.

Emerging from their former colonial status, the young states tried to resolve their domestic and regional problems not only individually but also by uniting, when necessary, in intergovernmental organisations.

By coming together in such organisations, they were pursuing an equally important goal—self-assertion in the international arena, the strengthening of their foreign policy positions. Such global problems as international peace and security, disarmament, liquidation of colonialism, the struggle against racism, reorganisation of international economic relations, and the many other problems requiring a collective solution, are raised and discussed by young states primarily in their international, and above all in their intergovernmental organisations. Having elaborated a common platform in those organisations, the liberated countries coordinate their actions at broader forums—at the UN and other international conferences and meetings.

The following main intergovernmental organisations of emergent countries are presently functioning (we list them in chronological order of formation): the League of Arab States (LAS), with headquarters in Tunis<sup>1</sup>, was founded in 1945 and has 22 members (including the PLO, representing the future Palestinian state, since 1976). The Organisation of African Unity (OAU), with headquarters in Addis Ababa, was founded in 1963 and has 51 members.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Up to March 1979 it was located in Cairo but was moved as a sanction against Egypt for signing the Camp David accords with Israel.

<sup>2</sup> The 51st member is the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, although its membership is still disputed by some OAU members.

The Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) was founded in 1960, has its headquarters in Vienna and a membership of 13 states. The Association of Southeast Asian Countries (ASEAN) was formed in 1967 with headquarters in Jakarta and has a membership of six states. The Organisation of Islamic Conference was set up in 1969 with headquarters in Jidda and has 44 members (including the PLO). The Caribbean Common Market (CARICOM) was established in 1972 with 13 members. The Latin American Economic System (LAES) was formed in 1975 with headquarters in Panama and has 25 members. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) was set up in 1975 with headquarters in Abidjan and has 16 members. The six-member Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (CCASG) was established in 1981 with headquarters in Riyadh. The Organisation of Regional Cooperation of South Asia (ORCSA) was set up in 1983 with headquarters in Delhi and consists of seven states.

Some international organisations of liberated countries arose before the official creation of the non-aligned movement, others came afterwards, and some are still being formed. The main feature of such organisations is that their membership must be made up exclusively of liberated countries. For example, the Organisation of American States (OAS) is not among them for the USA is a member, along with 20 emergent states of Latin America and the Caribbean, but the Latin American Economic System (LAES) is an organisation of liberated countries for it includes those and other countries of the region (Cuba for example) but not the USA.

The appearance of these organisations is a new phenomenon of international relations and world politics. It is a direct result of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system, which, in its turn, resulted from the changed world correlation of class forces in favour of socialism and democracy. At the same time it is a reason for the further deepening of this process. In other words, such organisations arose in connection with the strengthening of socialism in the international arena as a force curbing the aggressive aspirations and expansionism of imperialism.

The organisations of young states have become a new detachment of the large group of intergovernmental organi-

sations that began to emerge on a stable basis in the 19th century. The membership of this new group of organisations is growing.

These organisations exist in various areas of international relations—political, economic, cultural, financial, religious, scientific and technical, etc. Entire “systems” of such organisations have emerged and are similar to the UN system, for example, the system of the League of Arab States (LAS), the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) or the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC).

As is the case with all international organisations, these organisations are required to bring their purposes and principles into conformity with those of the UN Charter.

These international organisations of liberated countries have a number of common features, namely:

- their members are states that used to be colonies or semi-colonies;

- these organisations include states for which economic backwardness and dependent development is typical, and each of them, as a rule, unites countries with a relatively equal level of development of the productive forces;

- the existence and prospects of such organisations are directly connected with the changed world balance of class forces in favour of democracy and socialism, and directly depends on a strengthening of the world system of socialism;

- there is an increasing number of countries of socialist orientation in these organisations.

For that reason, these organisations are a forum for the continuation of the liberation struggle and are formed to protect the independence and ensure the economic and social development of their members.

Set up to ensure the development and greater independence of their members, these intergovernmental organisations aim to strengthen peace and security both regionally and worldwide. Uniting both countries of socialist orientation and those which have chosen a capitalist path of development, they are organisations of cooperation and peaceful co-existence. These organisations’ regionalism aims not only at collective security, as envisaged in Chapter 8 of the UN Charter, but also at uniting their members to elaborate and implement a joint political course and international princi-

ples for carrying out the political, economic and social tasks common for all member states. It should also be pointed out that the common geographical location of member states is an important feature but not the only one; of importance also are their common economic, linguistic, historical, national, ethnical, and religious features.

The charters of these organisations proclaim the objective of liberating the peoples of their territorial spheres from colonial domination and they therefore provide for various legal forms of participation by representative organisations of such peoples, even to the point of membership (for example, the PLO in the LAS and OIC). In this connection, the OAU and the LAS have gotten the non-aligned movement, the UN and its bodies to adopt the principle of recognising only those liberation movements which are recognised by the OAU and the LAS in their respective regions.

The inaugural acts of such organisations should conform to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and should be a concrete regional application of those principles.

All that has been said about this new group of international organisations shows that their principles and purposes coincide with or are similar to those of the non-aligned movement, though it is obvious that their political course is by no means always the same.

It is noteworthy that most, if not all, members of these organisations are non-aligned countries. Only one of them—OIC—includes a “bloc” country—Turkey, which is a NATO member.

At the same time among these organisations are some which only accept non-aligned members. For example, such is LAS practice, although its established rules do not provide for this. The reason is that its 1945 charter and 1950 Treaty on Joint Defence and Economic Cooperation were adopted before the movement came into being. But in the OAU—the largest and one of the most influential organisations of emergent nations—non-alignment is an obligatory requirement for membership (para. 7, Article 3 of the OAU Charter). We will therefore use the OAU as an example in looking at the relations between the non-aligned movement and the intergovernmental organisations of liberated countries.

The goals of the OAU (including the specific one of liqui-

dating colonialism) are typical of other intergovernmental organisations as well. They are: to promote the unity of member states, coordinate and intensify their cooperation, defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, eradicate colonialism, and promote international cooperation in accordance with to the UN Charter. The same can, on the whole, be said of its principles, which number seven: sovereign equality of member states, non-interference in their internal affairs, respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity, peaceful settlement of disputes, total eradication of colonialism in Africa, a ban on subversive activities and political assassinations between member states and, finally, adherence to a policy of non-alignment.

The OAU held a special discussion of its attitude to the non-aligned movement during the very first years of its existence. The Council of Ministers first tackled this question in February 1964 and the resolution it adopted became a basic and binding document for the organisation's members. From what has the OAU always proceeded in its relations with the movement? As laid down in the forementioned resolution and confirmed by a number of subsequent decisions and experience, the OAU's approach to the movement has two aspects: strengthening and use of the movement.

The OAU regards non-alignment as an active means for pursuing foreign policy that has nothing in common with passive neutrality and is a positive and progressive policy whose merit is recognised by various powers in the international community. In its attitude to the movement it proceeds from its members' conviction that cooperation between the emergent states is necessary in every area so as to eradicate imperialism in all its manifestations and maintain international peace and security. In addition, the OAU takes into consideration the role played by African states in maintaining international peace and security, and proceeds from its belief in peaceful co-existence. Furthermore, it considers that its members' undertaking to adhere to non-alignment promotes international detente. That is why the OAU is of the view that its members' participation in the movement helped to strengthen the anti-imperialist front.

It must be recognised that the OAU has in fact been



doing much to implement this line with respect to the non-aligned movement. Accounting for over half of the movement's membership during the first 20 years of its existence and for at least a third of UN members, the African states, as an organisational bloc of states, have always been an important factor of non-alignment in the world arena.

But it is not only a matter that the purposes and principles of the OAU coincide on the whole with those of the non-aligned movement. The crux of the matter is that under such circumstances support for and strengthening of the movement as a factor of world politics accords with the interest of OAU members in strengthening the international position of their own organisation.

The OAU began to pay special attention to this as the non-aligned movement strengthened and particularly in the process of preparing and holding sessions of its main bodies in Africa (above all the conferences in Lusaka—1970, and Algiers—1973). In 1972 the Council of Ministers passed a special resolution on holding consultations between African countries in advance of the various meetings of non-aligned states, with its preamble stating that Africa must play an important role in international organisations, especially those which include third world countries, and primarily non-aligned states. Its operative part also recommends that regular consultations continue between OAU member states with a view to coordinating their positions, particularly in advance of non-aligned conferences, so as more actively to mobilise third world countries and the international community to support African countries. The OAU has been pursuing this line very vigorously.

As OAU documents have repeatedly pointed out, its members' collective viewpoint is that non-alignment provides a suitable basis for effective mobilisation of third world countries and for proof of their solidarity with Africa.

Thus, both formally and in fact, the OAU's attitude to the non-aligned movement is one of strengthening the movement so as to achieve the common goals of member states. Despite some explainable political pragmatism, this position cannot be described as a selfish one. From the OAU point of view, it dialectically links its own purposes and interests and those of the movement. That is the standpoint from

which one should look at the reiterations in documents of the supreme OAU bodies—the Assembly and the Council of Ministers—that it adheres to the principles of the UN Charter and the principles of non-alignment.

And what is the movement's position? It is naturally greatly influenced by the actions of OAU members, if only because up until recently they made up an absolute majority in the movement. However movement decisions, which are reached by consensus, are a common position of all members, which is why an answer to the question posed may be found in a document adopted by the 1964 non-aligned summit on the creation of the OAU and entitled "Special Resolution No. 1". This document noted the solidarity of the movement with the African states in their fight to consolidate their independence and achieve complete liberation of the continent through cooperation. The conference welcomed the fact that in signing the OAU Charter its members had unreservedly adhered to the positive policy of non-alignment. Reaffirming that the movement had been formed to use all appropriate means to combat colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism, the session did justice to what the OAU had managed to achieve in that direction in the little more than a year since its creation.

With respect to the relationship between the OAU and the non-aligned movement, the summit gave a positive but balanced assessment, regarding the OAU as a part of the common struggle. Noting that the establishment of the OAU was "an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace", the session at the same time recognised that the coming into being of that organisation was a "triumph of the policy of non-alignment, and the fundamental values laid down by this policy".<sup>1</sup> The conference decided to coordinate and concert the movement's efforts with those of the OAU "with a view to safeguarding their joint interests in economic, social and cultural development and international cooperation".<sup>2</sup>

The foregoing shows, on the one hand, the attitude of intergovernmental organisations of emergent states to the movement, i.e. participation in and strengthening of it to

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

promote its own goals, and, on the other hand, the movement's attitude to those organisations, i.e. greater cooperation with them on the basis of the community of interests of all movement members so as to consolidate it as a global factor of international relations.

Of course, in such cooperation a major role is played by both the size of the membership and the international prestige of each international organisation of emergent states and by the political complexion of the influential groups of countries in each of them. The 20-year experience of the movement shows that the three largest organisations—the OAU, OIC and LAS—have the greatest weight in its activity. Thus, the activity of the OAU determines the movement's consistent anti-colonialism. LAS and OIC influence has invigorated the movement's moral and political stance on the Palestinian and the general Middle East questions. On the other hand, in 1980 certain OIC members got the organisation to initiate in non-aligned bodies consideration of the problems of South-West Asia from a biased anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet standpoint.

These organisations' weight in the movement is also evident in the protocol observed. Their secretaries general are invited, along with the UN Secretary General, to attend sessions of non-aligned conferences and as a rule attend their plenary meetings.

Yet another aspect of the cooperation between the movement and international organisations of emergent countries, should be noted: the international organisations elaborate a united position not only in order to put it forward and champion it at upcoming sessions of the movement's main bodies. In their view, a number of questions require consideration and resolution at the UN. By getting their decisions laid down in final non-aligned documents they thereby receive the *de facto* support of the entire movement. In other words, when one of those questions is placed on the agenda of, say, the regular UN General Assembly session, the initiators' draft resolution on it already has two-thirds of UN votes.

The relations between the movement and the second group of international organisations of emergent countries—non-governmental (public) organisations—are on a somewhat different scale, officially existing with only one organi-

sation—the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO). Since 1972 this organisation has been regularly invited to ministerial meetings, since 1973—to conferences, and later to sessions of the movement's Bureau. In 1972 it attended as a guest but since 1973 it has had observer status, the delegation head giving a message of greeting at each plenary session.

There are objective reasons for the AAPSO's exclusive position. First of all, it is a large organisation representing the progressive public of the bulk of non-aligned member countries.

The objectives of the movement of solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa coincide in their anti-imperialist and peace-promoting direction with those of the non-aligned movement. Under its charter it also fights for the peoples' national independence and freedom and works to eliminate imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid and racism, including Zionism, opposes aggression, intervention, illegal occupation and foreign domination, and advocates free self-determination of the peoples, national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and progressive social and economic development.

Of course, differences do exist between them. For example, while the non-aligned movement is composed of states (with two liberation organisations—the PLO and SWAPO—the only exceptions), the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation is composed of public organisations, including national liberation movements representing the peoples of their countries, and of well-known public figures.

There is another difference connected with the first: AAPSO is not merely an anti-imperialist, peace-promoting organisation but also has a great social potential since it represents peoples and includes liberation movements that in their turn act on behalf of their oppressed peoples.

There are objective historical explanations for the coincidence of purposes and tasks of the two movements and for the differences between them. As an organisational force, the movement of anti-imperialist solidarity of the peoples emerged earlier, beginning its organisational formation in 1955 with the first conference of the progressive public of Asia and completing it at the constituent conference held in Cairo from 26 December 1957 to 1 January 1958. At that

time the bulk of the now independent countries were under the colonial yoke. Even then the imperialist powers were striving not only to keep the peoples of those countries dependent in some form but also to suppress their national liberation, progressive, popular forces so as to prevent their future development on a path of social progress and economic independence on a truly anti-imperialist basis. The AAPSO has always fought against this.

In 1955 delegations from 23 states and one colony of Asia and Africa assembled in Bandung to elaborate a unified platform in world politics, the meeting ending with the Bandung Final Communiqué. Most of the countries attending the Bandung conference were already oriented toward non-alignment.

Later, in 1961, with the collapse of imperialism's colonial system continuing apace, an inter-state association—the anti-imperialist solidarity movement of non-aligned countries—was formed in Belgrade.

It is very important that in both instances a factor of the emergence and development of the movements was recognition of the need for international solidarity and unity in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism, and for peace and security on earth.

Of significance also is the historical fact that the cradle of both movements was India, the largest liberated country and an influential factor of peace and freedom in Asia and Africa. It was in that country that Jawaharlal Nehru formulated in 1946 the idea of non-alignment, which was originally called "non-commitment". And it was there that the first conference of the public of Asian countries, which resulted in the formation of AAPSO, took place in 1955.

The common anti-imperialist and peace-promoting character of the two movements objectively determined their cooperation not only in the past and today but in the future as well. There is good reason why, as soon as it was decided to invite national liberation movements to non-aligned meetings (Lusaka conference, September 1970), AAPSO was also invited to attend the next meeting (the Georgetown Foreign Ministers meeting in August 1972).

But such cooperation is only the organisational reflection of real solidarity between the two movements, as evidenced by the fact that their meetings consider identical po-

litical, economic and social problems. This is also readily seen in a comparison of the agendas of the seventh non-aligned summit (1983) and the sixth AAPSO congress (1984). Both included an assessment of the international situation; the tasks in the struggle against imperialism for true national independence, for peace, disarmament and security, for a just new international economic order and socio-economic change; consideration of urgent regional problems—the situation in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf; and formulation of a long-term Action Programme. The AAPSO congress also discussed the organisation's role in supporting the non-aligned movement.

In recent years, both AAPSO and the non-aligned movement have been particularly concerned over the deterioration of the international situation brought about by the aggressive policy of imperialism, and primarily the US administration, which has been upsetting the existing system of international relations and trying to take the world back to the period of undivided sway by imperialism and colonialism. The US rejects or sabotages all the peace initiatives of socialist community and non-aligned countries, and is stepping up expansionism and aggression worldwide, the non-aligned countries being the first to fall victim to this policy. There is good reason why, in closing the seventh conference, Indira Gandhi declared that “without peace ... all our dreams of development turn to ashes”.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, these words are now more urgent than ever. The peace and security of all peoples, on every continent, is in equal danger, a danger which stems from the deployment of US medium range missiles in Europe, the increase in the naval forces of imperialism, primarily American imperialism, in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, in the Pacific and in the Mediterranean, from US aggression against Grenada, Nicaragua and other countries, from Israeli and American aggression against Lebanon, and from the aggression against Vietnam and Kampuchea. The US has been trying to take the arms race into outer space, where the USSR and India have been successfully cooperating in recent years in the interests of peace and the development of both countries. The Reagan

<sup>1</sup> *UN Document A/38/132, Appendix II, p. 146.*

Administration is imposing a chemical arms race on the world.

It is only natural that AAPSO always takes sides with the non-aligned movement in pursuing their common anti-imperialist, anti-colonial and peace-loving objectives. The 1961 founding conference of the movement received a message of solidarity from AAPSO, five points of which expressed the hope that the conference would outline specific measures to assist the peoples fighting for independence and the liquidation of colonialism, to strengthen international peace, effect disarmament and peaceful coexistence, and introduce the Bandung principles in international relations so as to unify all anti-imperialist and anti-colonial forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In December 1983 the 12th AAPSO Presidium meeting sent non-aligned movement chair-person Indira Gandhi a special message noting that wherever the peoples encounter imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, Zionism and racism they feel the support of the movement in their struggle for justice, social progress, dignity, independence and peace. The message states that the movement has gained prestige by championing peace and disarmament and that AAPSO is "sure that the non-aligned movement will continue to do everything possible to defend world peace and international security". The Presidium declared that AAPSO regards the non-aligned movement as "the reflection of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples struggling for independence, defence of sovereignty and world peace, for better and prosperous life free from exploitation and interference".

Naturally, each meeting of AAPSO governing bodies discusses the strengthening and expansion of cooperation with the non-aligned movement, and takes decisions and passes resolutions to that end. Thus, in its Final Declaration the sixth Congress, the supreme organ of AAPSO, held in 1984 in Algiers, urged that the non-aligned movement be strengthened as a dynamic factor that "assumes a considerable role in the contemporary international relations in favour of peace, cooperation and progress of peoples". In addition, the Congress adopted a separate "Declaration on Non-Alignment" in which AAPSO reiterated that it adhered to the principles and ideals of the movement for the promotion of peace, cooperation, the elimination of imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, and racism, including Zionism.

While making a positive assessment of the movement's activity, AAPSO urged it to play a greater role in the search for peaceful settlements of the disputes between its members and in the prevention of any attempt to undermine its unity. It called attention to the need for increased respect for the purposes and principles of non-alignment and urged movement members not to grant imperialism facilities for establishing military bases on their territories.

It should be noted that since it represents peoples of Asia and Africa and is therefore more specific in its social and political purposes and tasks, AAPSO assesses the place of the non-aligned movement in the present-day world political alignment of forces more objectively than some movement members. Thus, the forementioned resolution of the 11th meeting of its Presidium declares that non-alignment does not mean that enemy and friends are treated as allies. It goes on stating that the socialist community has proved to be a friend and ally to the liberation movement, to the developing countries embarking on socio-economic transformation and to the non-aligned movement as a whole. It is also said that this does not imply necessarily a conformity of concepts and an identical way of resolving problems of strategy and development between allies; it does imply, however, that the imperialist powers, colonialism and neocolonialism, militarism and the exponents of the arms race are, per force, the enemy that should and must be combated.

The relations between the non-aligned movement and AAPSO are a politically important dialectical unity of anti-imperialist forces, one of which brings together states while the other brings together public forces. While their social essence means that their final goals are not the same, each of them proceeds, from the objective need to pool their efforts to carry out common tasks in the international arena.

An examination of the relations between the non-aligned movement and international organisations of young countries makes it possible not only to enhance the movement's role and place in the organisational structure of modern international relations but also to see the possibilities and limits of its actions in the international arena. At the same time the examination reveals the importance for the movement of true anti-imperialist unity of all the organisational components of the forces which constitute it.



### The Non-Aligned Movement and International Law

All that has been said about the non-aligned movement shows it to be, in Mikhail Gorbachev's words, an authoritative and progressive force of our day. It is obvious that having become such an important factor of present-day international relations and world politics, the movement has been increasingly influencing the sphere of international law, i.e. the system of norms governing the conduct of states. Nevertheless, Indian researcher T. V. Subba Rao was in the main correct when he wrote in 1981 that "non-alignment as such did not receive any attention from the publicists and practitioners of International Law".<sup>1</sup> He is right in the main because his reproach cannot be applied to the Soviet science of international law, which has been studying the legal aspects of non-alignment virtually since the movement came into being.<sup>2</sup> At roughly the same time Soviet studies were published which dealt with non-alignment as an international legal principle and institution that differed completely from the traditional institution of neutrality. Since then Soviet international law textbooks have also regarded non-alignment as a foreign policy concept and inter-state association.

Yet it should be noted that the appearance of Subba Rao's monograph, the first of its kind in world international law literature which gives not only a political characterisation but also an international legal assessment of the movement, is historically justified and timely.

And in Chapter 2 of this book, we have already touched

<sup>1</sup> T. V. Subba Rao, *Non-Alignment in International Law and Politics*, Second Edition, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1984, p. 133.

<sup>2</sup> See the first special article by D. I. Baratashvili, "Positivniy neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave" (Positive Neutrality in International Law), *Sovietskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 6, 1963.

on the international legal basis of the movement, showing it to be the totality of universally recognised principles of peaceful co-existence along with the principle of non-alignment based on them.

In this chapter we will look at two international legal aspects of the existence and activity of the movement: its legal nature and its participation in international legislation.

In order to analyse the legal nature of this new phenomenon of international relations, it is necessary first to clarify its place in the modern institutional structure of international relations, i.e. in the system of structural and organisational formations in modern international, primarily inter-state, relations.

The non-aligned movement is not an international conference. Unlike a conference, it does not consider just one question (problem); the agendas of the meetings of its main bodies include a broad range of problems—practically all the main questions considered at the UN. Furthermore, the movement has no time limits or deadlines for discussing the questions; it functions indefinitely. It is not convened either by an international organisation or a group of states; its bodies meet on the basis of decisions taken by bodies of the movement itself.

On the other hand, the non-aligned movement is not an international organisation. Unlike an organisation, it does not have a basic treaty or charter, neither does it have a permanent executive body, international civil service or headquarters. It has no membership in the usual sense of the word—with obligatory membership fees. The movement therefore does not have its own budget.

That is why the non-aligned movement is neither an international conference nor an international organisation. It is a new type of inter-state association. Along with the Group of 77, it is, like conferences and organisations, an independent part of the system of such associations.

The movement, as an association, is made up of states, each of them now having the international legal status of a non-aligned state. What does that mean?

Non-alignment is a legal status freely accepted by a state under which it assumes the moral, political and legal commitment to adhere to the postulates and purposes of the movement.

Certainly, the international legal status of a non-aligned state results first of all from its voluntary undertaking to work for the goals of the movement (before it was formed—for the goals of non-alignment) on the basis of strict observance of its principles. However, such an undertaking was sufficient only while the policy of non-alignment was taking shape in international relations, i.e. in the 1940s and 1950s. Once the movement was officially formed in 1961, the five criteria for non-alignment took effect, and they are still operative. The situation was further formalised in 1976 when formal “admission” into the movement was introduced.

Since then the attitude of member countries to a country's application for membership has acquired much greater importance, with each member proceeding from its own interests. However, the process of comparing and taking into account all these interests leads, via consensus, to a common denominator that may differ considerably from the initial position of this or that member or group of members. One example is the 1979 admission of Iran and Pakistan. The member states' positions with regard to the applications of the two countries were rather different. Most of the Arab countries, especially those of the Persian Gulf, already had (even before the Iran-Iraq war) quite different attitudes to these two states. These were also other member countries, including very influential ones, which considered their interests with respect to these applications in a manner that differed greatly from that of the Arab countries. The result was an original “package” deal whereby the two applicants were admitted to the movement, bringing fresh concerns rather than removing the doubts regarding their admission.

But an indispensable condition for non-aligned membership is a legal one, i.e. a country must (in the opinion of the Bureau and Meeting or Conference) conform to the so-called criteria of non-alignment.

According to these criteria, the status of a non-aligned state includes the following undertakings: to follow an independent foreign policy based on peaceful co-existence of states with different systems and on non-alignment; actively support the peoples' anti-colonial national liberation struggle; not to be a member of any multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of great power conflicts;

not to participate in any military agreement "deliberately concluded in the context of great power conflicts"; and not to make their territory available for foreign military bases created in that same "context".

In broader terms, the status of non-aligned state makes it obligatory for a country to work to effect the purposes and principles of the movement and to fulfill its obligations under the UN Charter.

Like any international legal status, the status of non-alignment also implies rights: the right to demand that the other movement members observe the five criteria (this right is collectively exercised, for example, when a state is being admitted to the movement); the right to have its status respected by other non-aligned states; and the right to equal participation in all non-aligned forums and spheres.

The above rights and duties constituting the international legal status of a non-aligned state is the minimum which ensues from the criteria for membership in the movement.

The list would be considerably broader if the rights and duties are looked at from the viewpoint of the purposes and principles of the movement as a whole. In that event the list would not only be a long one but would differ from author to author.

A brief list of these rights would boil down to the right to have the entire international community of states respect the international legal status and foreign policy of non-alignment of a given country; its support for the national liberation movements in keeping with international law; its non-participation in military alliances of the great powers and in other agreements that oppose it to any of those powers; and its demand to liquidate foreign bases and not establish new ones on its territory. These rights also ensue from the five criteria of non-alignment.

It goes without saying that in both theory and practice this status is lawful only if it accords with the political and legal basis of the non-aligned movement—the principles of peaceful co-existence.

But do all states have "a right to non-alignment"? This question arises primarily with respect to the "great powers", which are the five permanent Security Council members—the USSR, the USA, China, France and Britain. This concept is used in that sense in non-aligned documents as well.

It is evident from the five criteria of non-alignment that what is meant is: a) all the great powers, i.e. the five states; b) the impermissibility of alliances or agreements in a "context of conflicts" between the great powers as a whole and not between any particular ones; c) not only alliances and agreements that existed in 1961 but also others which might emerge in the future in the "context of great power conflicts". For that reason, in line with the logic of the basic sources of the status of non-alignment, a great power may not join the movement.

Does this mean that the movement is opposed to the great powers? Not at all. Evidently what is meant is recognition by non-aligned countries of the real significance of the five powers and especially of the USSR and the USA on matters of war and peace; recognition of the reality of the division of the world caused and sustained by imperialism; of the need to eliminate this division or at least to take it out of a context of conflicts through the pooled efforts of those states whose individual influence on international relations is, in the existing situation, incomparable with that of any of the great powers. That is a possible answer to the question, an answer from the standpoint of ensuring international peace and security.

The foregoing makes it clear that this new type of interstate association cannot but have its legal features, i.e. its legal character.

The quarter century of constant practice and the unanimous resolutions repeatedly placed in writing have resulted in the following legal features of the movement, which make up its legal character.

1. While not having a basic treaty-charter the movement has nevertheless been existing and developing successfully on the basis of the universally recognised principles of modern common international law and the common norms and principles elaborated by the practice of the movement itself and those which members deem necessary to lay down in non-aligned documents.

2. It is a completely voluntary association created by sovereign states on the basis of strict respect for the principle of their sovereign equality.

3. It is based on each member's obligatory acceptance of the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and the prin-

ciples of peaceful co-existence, which form the common legal base of the movement.

4. Another basic principle of the movement is that of non-alignment.

5. Not only states but also liberation movements that are the sole representatives of states in formation may be full members of the movement.

6. Membership is stipulated not only by legal and technical conditions (consideration of an application, etc.) but also by the five written criteria, which the applicant must meet.

7. Although an open association, the movement excludes the possibility of the great power permanent UN Security Council members joining or taking any participation whatsoever in its bodies.

8. The sole principle for decision-making for the entire system of the movement is consensus.

9. Decisions of non-aligned bodies vary in character, some of them being obligatory.

10. In line with the experience of the movement, it possesses a peculiar international legal personality.

Can one speak of an "international legal institution of non-alignment"?

Non-alignment is a new institution of international law. From what has been said about the status of a non-aligned state and the legal character of the non-aligned movement, it follows that a totality of norms and principles has been established which regulate the specific sphere of inter-state relations. This sphere arose on the basis of a group of states adhering to certain purposes and principles in their relations with each other and in their collective position in world politics.

The formation of the institution of non-alignment proceeded jointly and in connection with the emergence and strengthening of the non-aligned movement as an association of states linked by the purposes and principles of a new foreign policy in international relations.

The institution of non-alignment strengthened as the movement developed the features of international legal personality, i.e. the ability to create norms of international law.

According to the ideas about international organisations'

legal personality that have been established on the basis of their legal formalisation and activity, treaty-charters are recognised as the basis of competence of such inter-state associations. As has already been mentioned, associations like the non-aligned movement have no charter. Furthermore, the international legal personality of inter-state organisations is expressed in the presence of certain rights and the ability to assume and fulfill duties on the basis of their charters of the principal original acts of international law. Obviously, this is not relevant as far as the non-aligned movement is concerned.

At the same time, the 25-year existence of the movement shows that it has become a real and effective factor not only of international political relations (which is a universally recognised fact) but also, at least within this framework, of international legislation.

While international legal personality is primarily a competence, it should be expressed and is expressed not merely in the fact of a subject of international law having rights and duties (and the capability to bear responsibility) but also in the capability to create international law by advancing international legal ideas and participating in the moulding, including conventional formulation, of new norms and principles of international law.

The legal basis of the movement is the will of its sovereign member states, which is clearly expressed in their creation and development of the movement.

With its present structure, the non-aligned movement, as an association of states, is incapable, if a parallel is drawn with inter-governmental organisations, of either having rights or assuming juridical commitments, for it is not a "legal person" and has neither body nor a person authorised to act on its behalf in international legal relations with other subjects of international law although within its own framework (unlike, say, the UN) all three types of modern subjects of international law—states, inter-governmental organisations, and peoples fighting for independence (the peoples of Palestine and Namibia)—function on an equal basis.

The development and growth of the movement's international influence is such that it has a special subjective quality in present-day international relations. The Soviet Union

not only highly assesses the movement as a factor promoting international peace and security; it considers it important to align the movement's real international weight and possibilities with the existing UN organisational mechanism for ensuring international peace and security. Addressing the 41st UN GA session on 23 September 1986, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said: "This Organisation would only stand to gain if the chair-country of the non-aligned movement participated in some form in the work of the Security Council."<sup>1</sup>

The non-aligned movement is a subject of international law but its legal personality is not only a derivative or secondary feature. It is peculiar even in this respect. Its legal personality is the legal personality of an association of states so organised that they carry out law-creating processes collectively. This new type of law-creating process can therefore tentatively be called the *collective legal personality* of the member countries. While neither prepared nor willing to authorise any of its bodies to carry out international law-creating processes, and not wishing to set up a permanent secretariat or to have administrative functionaries, they nevertheless collectively elaborate a common political and international legal position, unanimously formalise it in collective documents, and act collectively to implement this position, including at multilateral diplomatic (international legal) forums. Non-alignment as a means of diplomacy and foreign policy is expressed in that collective legal personality. Collective legal personality results from agreement of the political will of member countries within the framework of the purposes and principles of the movement so as to realise them. The countries need collective legal personality because individually they cannot (or can but with greater difficulty) achieve their common goals internationally, in particular formalise a necessary international legal norm or in other way express their common international legal position.

Collective legal personality enables the movement to pursue a collective policy internationally. Since the will of the states is agreed within their association and its bodies coordinate policy and are the mouthpieces of their common

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, 24 September 1986.



policy, one can speak about the policy of the movement as a whole. The movement is both a subject of international relations and a collective subject of international law.

Like any international or other legal personality, collective legal personality implies both the need and the possibility of the subject to have rights and duties. The distinctive features of the movement itself and the character of its legal personality make its rights and duties specific and limited. Among the rights are the right to be a part of the international community, the right to participate in international law-making procedures, and the right to create and have its own internal law, etc. Among the duties are the duty to strengthen member countries' independence, promote the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and to strengthen international peace and security.

A manifestation of international legal personality is the right to compulsion (sanctions), and practice has shown that the movement has this feature. An analogy may be drawn with the two types of sanctions applied by states through their international organisations: a) suspension of the rights and privileges arising from full and equal membership in the movement, and b) refusal of movement membership.

The first type of sanction was applied in 1973 against Chile and is still in effect. But this case has an important specific feature: it is not the Chilean state but rather the reactionary, usurper Pinochet regime whose right to participate in the movement (its bodies) has been suspended. As a state, Chile remains on the list of full and equal members but it may not be represented by that administration.

The second type of sanction—refusal of membership—has never been applied but there were instances when the participation of a non-member state in the work of movement bodies was under discussion and reaction inside the movement created a situation where such a sanction could have been applied.

The conceptual foundation of the movement is an anti-bloc policy, which underlies the five 1961 criteria for movement membership. Various non-aligned leaders have more than once expressed the hope of "resolving" or "softening" the blocs, but the USSR has consistently urged

simultaneous disbandment of NATO and the WTO. The new edition of the CPSU Programme says that the Soviet Union "will oppose the involvement of these (non-aligned— *Author*) states in military and political groupings".<sup>1</sup>

From this standpoint refusal of movement membership should be regarded as a means of pressure whose aim is and could only be to ensure international peace and security.

What has been said about the legal nature and international personality of the movement should facilitate a more precise assessment of the legal character of movement documents as well.

How do movement documents themselves evaluate the weight and force of their decisions and declared principles?

These documents often use expressions which do not apply to what could be termed recommendations. For example, in them members often "pledge" to observe non-aligned principles, and so on.

This is also true of the Political Declaration of the eighth conference (Harare, 1986), which says that non-aligned countries "renewed their commitment not to be parties to, nor take action leading to, great power confrontation and rivalry or the strengthening of existing military alliances" (para. 16). "They reaffirmed their commitment to adhere scrupulously to the principles and spirit of the Movement" (para. 17). At the end of the document the Heads of State or Government "stressed the need" to do everything possible to ensure that "the commitments made in the present Declaration" are implemented (para. 323).

The foregoing provisions of final political acts of sessions of the movement's supreme body make it obvious that in these documents, which are passed by consensus and represent the agreed will of member states, non-aligned countries stress that it is obligatory for them to fulfill a number of agreed rules of conduct, i.e. norms.

In the movement's experience, the norms laid down in conference documents or which take shape in the usual way express the collective political will of non-aligned countries. This will is a reflection of the movement's collective legal personality. There have been many statements to this effect

<sup>1</sup> *The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A New Edition*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1986, p. 72.

by various member countries throughout the movement's 25-year history.

What is the nature of these norms? Three types of norms may result from international agreements and the agreed will of states: political, recommendatory and legally binding norms under international law. That division of norms reflects the realities of the development of international political interaction of states in the post-war era. On the one hand, this is a rapidly increasing intensity of such interaction, including the development and expansion of old and the appearance of new areas in the organisational structure of international, primarily inter-state, relations. On the other hand, connected with that is the greater diversity not only in the formalisation of the results of such interaction and the agreement of the sides' interests and will, but also in the varying extent to which these results are made obligatory. Such a hierarchy of the norms of international relations, among which the norms of international law are the most binding, stems from the need to regulate inter-state relations (first and foremost) regardless of whether a norm is laid down in an international treaty. This is an imperative of our day because of the widening range of global problems, among which the most dangerous and most complicated is that of eliminating the threat of nuclear annihilation; it is necessitated by the realities of the present-day diversity of a contradictory and integral world.

At the same time the practice of international relations has shown on more than one occasion that, by their development tendency, all levels of that hierarchy are nothing but a stage in the formation of a higher norm of international law with its legally binding quality.

Worthy of note in this connection is the international legal technique widely employed by the movement and inter-governmental organisations of liberated countries and known in Western literature as "collective legitimisation", i.e. agreeing on positions within those associations and then pressing for them to be confirmed in UN resolutions.

It was not the liberated countries which first began using this technique: it is as old as multilateral meetings and collective resolutions and has also been used at the UN from the very outset.

But the young states have been making broad use of

collective legalisation since the 1970s and especially in the 1980s, with the non-aligned movement offering unprecedented possibilities for this.

As if summing up the use of this technique at the UN, well-known Indian specialist in international law Professor R. P. Anand writes: "The formalistic argument that the resolutions of the General Assembly are merely recommendatory, having no mandatory force under the UN Charter does not and cannot reflect the true legal position."<sup>1</sup>

Anand believes that UN General Assembly resolutions passed by an overwhelming majority or unanimously undoubtedly influence the development of international law. He continues: "Through its legally 'non-binding' resolution, the General Assembly has initiated a process that has helped in bringing tremendous changes in the traditional international legal system. The whole process of decolonization through multilateral denunciation of colonialism, rules in regard to self-determination, and reconsideration and re-drafting of the whole law of the sea are only a few examples of 'collective legitimization' or new 'legislative power' of the United Nations and its General Assembly. Traditional lawyers might brush aside the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States as not legitimate or as not enjoying universal support, but they can hardly ignore the political force of this measure which cannot leave the traditional law unchanged."<sup>2</sup>

That position is a clear one and has a real basis in experience. Collective legalisation through the adoption of UN resolutions is the most readily available way for the liberated countries to influence the development of international law.

The fairly broad use of collective legalisation in international "procedural" technique and in multilateral diplomatic activity encouraged the emergence in the 1970s of the concept of "soft law". This concept in the section signifying watering down or undermining international law as a system of legally binding norms and principles, could impress those in the newly-independent countries (and there are many of them) who regard modern international law as "European"

<sup>1</sup> R. P. Anand, *International Law and Developing Countries*, Banyan Publications, New Delhi, 1986, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

which does not meet the interests of the young states. However, "collective legalisation"—even if one agrees with the term—is only a technique and process for extending recognition of recommendatory norms so as to prepare the way for making them legally binding.

The general decisions of non-aligned conferences (above all the political and economic declarations) are not merely a summary of political joint intentions; they are declarations of common tasks, purposes, principles and guidelines for joint activity internationally and cooperation within the movement. For that reason they are, even formally speaking, recommendations for action and contain recommendatory norms. Yet it seems that in fact they are more than recommendations. That certainly is how the movement itself sees them, a fact expressed in the formulations of conference final documents. What is meant are not decisions with respect to structural changes or other obviously obligatory provisions in the sphere of the so-called internal law of the movement.

Such an assessment of inter-state declarations—acts that are not treaties—is not unexpected. There are many examples from the 1970s and 1980s of parties regarding a document called a declaration as something which directly binds them to a certain mode of conduct. Often these documents even outwardly resemble treaties: they are divided into articles (or paragraphs) and signed by heads of state or government. They state that they shall not contradict the "parties' commitments" under other treaties, and so on.

In the practice of international law there is now a new informal type of making quasi-treaty commitments by states. They are not only a result of the agreement of member states' will but also a form of placing a certain degree of legal obligation on parties.

Declarations of non-aligned summit conferences do not fully fall into that category. They are something in between quasi-treaty declarations and declarations of member states' political plans. Unlike recommendatory acts, they place on members obligations which have more than moral and political force for non-aligned countries since action taken by a non-aligned country, including in international legal relations, may not contradict the spirit or letter of conference decisions or the non-aligned principle. In their turn, the

latter must accord with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and the basic principles of international law.

This law-making role of the conferences is primarily evident in that which could be called the non-aligned movement's internal law.

On the whole the content of the movement's internal law has the same features as the internal law of international organisations, i.e. they regulate: ties between its bodies; relations between members; and relations between non-aligned countries and their movement.

However, the movement's internal law has an important specific feature. First of all, let us consider the sources of the internal law of the movement. The association has neither a charter nor written rules of procedure for its individual bodies. The source is established practice, which only in some instances is partially formulated in documents adopted by movement bodies. Such a formulation may be given in the documents of any existing movement body. Earlier formulations may be changed. An example of formalisation in writing of competence and rules of functioning is the "Recommendations on the Coordinating Bureau", a document adopted at the fifth conference session in 1976. An example of a changed formulation with respect to the movement's internal law is the repeated decision for the conference (as of its fifth session) to broaden that same Bureau, while other movement bodies function according to rules set in the usual way. Thus, apart from its written decision on the desirability of holding sessions periodically (from 1979) and a few other documentary provisions, the conference functions on the basis of ordinary norms. For example, there are no written rules concerning its very important sub-bodies—the Bureau sessions, the Chairman-Coordinator, etc.

Another important specific feature of the movement's internal law is that in principle there is no (and cannot be permitted) voting on its bodies. From the very outset an obligatory norm has been that decisions are taken on all bodies and sub-bodies by consensus. For a long time (up to 1979) this law remained unwritten in the movement.

Yet another distinctive feature of the movement's law as compared with that of international organisations stems from the criteria for movement membership. A movement

member may not be a member of NATO, ASPAC, ANZUS (previously SENTO and SEATO), or WTO, or a great power. But this does not mean that the movement is a closed inter-state association.

With respect to the first subject of regulation of the movement's internal law—ties between its bodies—it can be said that in the past 25 years the movement structure has not only developed and stabilised but has done so largely in the usual—juridical—way, and rules for subordination and cooperation between its bodies have been elaborated. Of greatest importance is the existing hierarchy, which rests on this sequence: Conference—Meeting—Bureau.

With respect to the second subject of regulation of the movement's internal law—relations between members—it should be said that they are primarily regulated by the norms and principles which have emerged outside the movement framework and on the basis of the main principles of international law. From a legal standpoint, the reason for this is that every non-aligned state is first and foremost a UN member and the purposes and principles of the UN Charter have preferential force under that act.

But relations between non-aligned countries within the movement are also governed by a special principle that is recognised by all—the principle of non-alignment.

Finally, the third subject of regulation of the movement's internal law—member states' relations with their movement. It should first of all be noted that, unlike international organisations, the movement has no body or person authorised to deal with relations with member countries, which is why some non-aligned countries still cannot have treaty or other agreement-based relations with the movement as their association. But this does not mean that all such countries, as movement members, do not have certain rights and duties before the movement as something which forms a whole.

Among member countries' rights in this sphere are the right to take part in the work of all movement bodies, including the right to be elected to the Coordinating Bureau, the right to appeal for the movement's collective support in the event of violation of the status of non-alignment, for example by convening an extraordinary Bureau session, and the right to take movement-wide initiatives aimed at realis-

ing its purposes and principles.

In its turn, through its main bodies the movement has the right to demand that its members strictly fulfill the movement's purposes and principles and unswervingly observe its status as a non-aligned state, including the international legal principle of non-alignment.

Among member countries' duties are: to strengthen movement unity on the basis of its purposes and principles, actively support its anti-imperialist, anti-colonial, and anti-nuclear stance, and not to allow any action, on its part or with respect to itself, which harms such positions and purposes and principles of the movement.

In its turn the movement has the duty to strengthen the independence and economic development of its members both on a global level and in its own framework, to seek to establish firmly the principles of peaceful co-existence in relations between its members, including by actively promoting peaceful settlement of disputes between them, and to champion members' interests in universal and regional intergovernmental organisations and at other international forums.

The principle of non-alignment is the basic principle of the movement's internal law and regulates the second and third areas of its subject. It should be noted that in this case it is a question not of a universally recognised principle but of one that is recognised as obligatory in the relations of the 100 states of the non-aligned movement.

The process of formation of the non-aligned principle provides conclusive proof that in our day the length of practice is not the decisive circumstance for firmly establishing a usual norm in international law.

The emergence and operation of the principle of non-alignment is one of the most major specific effects in international law-making procedure of the collapse of imperialism's colonial system and a sign of the democratisation of general international law.

More than 20 years ago this author wrote that the non-aligned principle has always required and will continue to require a major fight to defend and implement it for it means a fight against colonialism, against the imperialist policy of war and arms race, and for a firmer peace and cooperation between peoples.



The author by no means idealises the non-aligned principle but he is convinced that its social and legal significance lies precisely in that historical destiny; that precisely for that reason the principle deserves attention; that it is precisely for that reason that today, too, it has many opponents, including among different circles of those countries which promoted its formation; and that it expresses the movement's international legal authority and progressive character.

But the movement's international law-making procedure cannot be reduced to the development of its internal law alone. The movement has an ever greater role in the formation and development of norms and principles of common international law.

Those who are acquainted with declarations of movement conferences and meetings must have been struck by the exaggeration of the role and significance of that association in some areas of international relations and humanity's development as a whole. This is to be found in all declarations since the 1961 Belgrade Declaration. Thus, at the height of the cold war, the 25 economically underdeveloped and militarily weak countries that had only just come together stated that they were a very important factor of international peace and security. Twenty-five years later their movement did become that and not so much because its membership had quadrupled as because the increase in membership itself as a result of decolonisation and a strengthening of the movement's positions internationally was made possible in part by the presence of world socialism. In the fight against imperialism and in the process of democratisation of international relations decisive importance attaches not to words and exhortations but to real actions and the creation of a potential which imperialism cannot ignore. Unfortunately, carried away by a formal interpretation of the anti-bloc policy, many non-aligned leaders often kept a distance from world socialism "on principle", resulting in their having an understated idea about this powerful, in fact decisive, anti-imperialist force.

The effects of such an assessment are to be felt in the movement to this day. Thus, with internal and external factors of international relations having indeed made the movement an influential force in the world, the Political

Declaration of the eighth summit in Harare describes the movements as "the foremost movement for peace in the world" (para. 14). This is also somewhat of a political exaggeration.

Such exaggeration apparently has the political and propaganda aim of giving added weight to the movement's "image" but it nevertheless seems that its roots lie in the old view, one not confirmed by practice, that non-alignment is a "third force" between the "two blocs", that it is an "independent force" between the "two superpowers". History has shown that the movement's independence stems from a balanced assessment of the international situation and the prospects for the development of international relations and from activity carried out on that basis to safeguard member countries' independence and peace on earth, and not from a striving to isolate itself.

These exaggerations lead to an overestimation of the movement's political and diplomatic possibilities and sometimes to dubious theses in member countries' international legal doctrine. Specifically this author means the nihilistic attitude of some international relations experts to common international law and the claim that the movement is the creator of a new, non-Eurocentrist international law. One example of this is the forementioned book by T. V. Subba Rao.<sup>1</sup> In fact one can only speak of further democratisation of international law, an endeavour in which the movement can do much jointly with the socialist community.

The Soviet science of international law has repeatedly been critical of such nihilistic positions, noting that they do not adequately reflect the objective need and basis for the young countries' desire to change international law. Criticising those young states which pressed for a full rejection of established international law on the eve of and during the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, Professor S. V. Molodtsov wrote that such nihilism was groundless because a truly revolutionary approach to historical development, including the development of international law, did not aim at universal and radical abolition of the legacy of the past but rather at abolishing only what was outdated, conservative and counter to the progress of the peoples and

<sup>1</sup> Subba Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 136-137.

states, while maintaining and developing those values which have not lost their significance in present-day conditions.

Since the 1960s these words have over and over been shown to be correct at the numerous diplomatic conferences in which non-aligned countries helped to elaborate international conventions.

The best example was the drafting of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

But it serves not only to show that the nihilist position is groundless; it is an equally good example of the non-aligned movement's real influence on international law-making processes. It should be noted that there is no serious work on the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea which would not mention the role of non-aligned countries.<sup>1</sup>

This role is already evident in the movement's impact on the organisational and procedural aspects of the convention drafting.

First, consolidation of the positions and greater co-operation between developing states gradually intensified, especially during the first sessions.

Second, some words need to be said about the movement's cooperation with the Group of 77.

The Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, which dealt with economic problems, was attended by the Group of 77, but it fully represented the movement, which "internally" was trying to reach a united position.

The importance of the role eventually played by the Group of 77 and not of regional groups or interest groups at the Conference is evident in the fact that, following voting on the Convention on 30 April 1982, the delegations of many non-aligned countries underscored in their final statements that they had acted in line with the position taken by the Group of 77.

With respect to the third organisational and procedural aspect of the movement's impact on the Convention drafting, it may be said the following. The question of how to make the most effective use of its "numerical superiority" has always been a very important one in Group of 77 tac-

<sup>1</sup> See S. K. Agarwala, T. S. Rama Rao, J. N. Saxena (ed-s), *New Horizons of International Law and Developing Countries*, ILA (Indian Branch), Tripathi Private Ltd., New Delhi, 1984.

tics.<sup>1</sup> This question was discussed at the fourth non-aligned conference on the eve of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea. It was noted that there was a need for the Law of the Sea conference to ensure its success through adequate preparation and adoption of rules of procedure permitting the rapid achievement of positive results and insuring the maximum possible degree of agreement. The threat to resort to voting turned out to be an unsuitable means of political pressure. This became evident from a sober assessment of the situation and an understanding of the fact that international law means agreeing positions of making inevitable compromises.

What were the non-aligned positions on the law of the sea formulated at movement conferences and meetings?

The third summit conference, held in September 1970 in Lusaka and attended by 54 non-aligned UN members, passed a "Resolution on the Seabed" that for the first time formulated member countries' collective "basic principles" on the law of the sea.

The resolution stated, in particular, that the "seabed and ocean floor, and the sub-soil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction ... are the common heritage of mankind... No state shall exercise or claim sovereign right over any part" of the area. It also stated that the area "shall be used exclusively in peaceful purposes" and that "the exploration of the area and the exploitation of its resources shall be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of states."

The 25th UN General Assembly session, held in that same year, passed the Declaration of Principles Governing the Seabed and Ocean Floor and the Subsoil Thereof Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (Resolution 2749 (XXV)), the first 15 paragraphs of which contain almost word for word the principles of the Lusaka conference resolution.<sup>2</sup>

In 1972 the movement's Georgetown meeting raised the question more broadly, considering the law of the sea as a whole. The meeting declared its resolve "to cooperate fully in the codification, progressive development and harmoniza-

<sup>1</sup> Obminskii E. E., *Gruppa 77*, Moscow, 1981, p. 80 (In Russian).

<sup>2</sup> *Yearbook of the United Nations*, Vol. 24, 1970, p. 66.

tion of the law of the sea which would take into consideration the interests of developing countries and those of the international community of the states".<sup>1</sup>

The fourth non-aligned summit in 1973 in Algiers formalised the agreement of the Latin American and African positions on a number of important questions of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, including the 200-mile zone on which Latin America was insisting, and Africa's demand for an exclusive economic zone, including a fishery zone.

The summit reiterated its collective position on what the Convention called an "area" and on what non-aligned countries had earlier designated as "common heritage of mankind".

The Algiers document also made an official statement on the movement's common approach to future norms, stressing that "the new rules of the law of the sea must effectively contribute to eliminate the threats to the security of states and to ensure respect for their sovereignty and their territorial integrity." It further recommended that the rules governing the use and development of maritime resources provide for the protection of maritime environment.

The Heads of State or Government stated that they "regard as indispensable a previous consultation among the non-aligned countries to coordinate their positions and actions on the problems of principles and procedure in order to rapidly arrive at satisfactory results.

Such were the initially agreed collective positions of non-aligned countries on the codification and development of the law of the sea.

All of them were enshrined in the UN 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea, including such new institutes and principles of the sea as a 200-mile exclusive economic zone, an international seabed area as the area of common heritage of mankind, an international seabed body, protection of the marine environment, defence of the interests of continental countries and geographically disadvantaged states.

Along with other socialist countries, the Soviet Union pressed for a mutually-acceptable "package" of compromise decisions that took into consideration the legitimate rights

<sup>1</sup> *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, Vol. XXIII, 5 September 1972, p. 21.

and interests of all states. By meeting the positions of most developing and other countries halfway, the Soviet Union helped to bring the positions of all participating states closer. For the sake of compromise, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made, for example, very substantial concessions in fishery, navigation, marine research and other areas. At the same time the USSR firmly rebuffed the proposals of those who tried to impose arbitrary decisions aimed to undermine international navigation and fishery and unilaterally seize and divide the world ocean and its resources.

A diametrically opposed stance was held by the Reagan Administration, which insisted on a vote on the text of the Convention, which had been drafted with such difficulty, and then refused to sign it.

As shown by non-aligned countries, participation in the organisational and procedural work of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea and in the drafting of the Convention, on the whole they act unitedly in their own movement and can and do exert an all-round and sometimes very substantial influence on international law-making and the development of international law. This influence results both from summit conferences and from the coordinated work of movement members at international diplomatic conferences.

Let us take another example, that one of non-aligned countries' participation in the codification of the principles of peaceful co-existence in the 1960s on the Special Committee created for that purpose by the UN General Assembly.

As is common knowledge, in 1970 the 25th Assembly session unanimously adopted a "Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance with the UN Charter" as Resolution 2625/XXV. During the Special Committee's six years of work on this document, non-aligned countries, which made up more than half of the Committee, were very active and operated as a single group on behalf of the whole movement.

An example of the group's activity on the Special Committee was its work in the formulation of one of the most important principles for young states—that of the equality

and self-determination of the peoples.

The Special Committee actually split into two groups during discussion of the self-determination principle: the imperialist states, and socialist and non-aligned countries. Discussion of the wording was hard and long.

The American and British proposals were fundamentally unacceptable. Thus, the American draft did not define the concept of the peoples' right to self-determination even in the way that it had been formulated in the 1960 Declaration on Decolonisation, and the whole text implied that this right merely meant the right to determine the state and political system of the life of the peoples. Further, under the pretext of pinpointing the subject of this right and the instances in which the principle itself would be applicable, considerable limitations were actually placed in the way of exercising it: the range of peoples who could enjoy this right was being narrowed. Instead of recognising independence or immediate transferring all power to the peoples of those territories (as formulated in the Declaration on Decolonisation and other UN resolutions), "self-government" was again proposed. In addition, referring to chapter 12 of the UN Charter but actually running counter to decisions of the UN itself, the USA attempted to perpetuate its domination over a "strategic trusteeship territory" in the Pacific, while section "B" of the American proposal was an outright attempt juridically to substantiate liquidation of the peoples' right to self-determination.

The British proposal was also unacceptable, repeating as it did the shortcomings of the US proposal. The very principle of self-determination was interpreted not as a right of the peoples but as a totality of states' undertakings. Further, contrary to paragraph 2 of article 1 of the UN Charter and the Declaration on Decolonisation, the concept of the "peoples' readiness" for independence was restored (para. 2 "d"). Finally, the British proposal reduced the exercise of the right to self-determination to an act carried out on one occasion, and what is more, to an act which could only decide the question of a people's state and political system.

The imperialist states persisted in trying to "broaden" the object of the principle and in formulating it vaguely and generally. They put forward the formulation of "foreign

domination" but went no further than that. Their delegations gave as grounds the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples and other General Assembly resolutions, saying that the socialist states, too, had voted for them. The obvious aim, as they let slip more than once, was to obtain a formal pretext for the revolting fabrication that the Soviet Union has breached the principle of peoples' equality and self-determination both inside the USSR and in the socialist camp as a whole.

Yet while opposing concretisation of the principle, for example on the anti-colonial question, the Western delegations made mention of the fact that their representatives had not voted for the Declaration on Decolonisation.

On the whole the developing countries supported the idea of making the object of that principle universal. True, they pointed out that the concept "foreign domination" is broader than that of "colonialism" and that they were quite satisfied with the former since, along with the problem of colonialism, it also includes the Palestinian and other burning questions. At the same time they were interested in having the Declaration on the Principles of International Law condemn colonialism and include formulations from anti-colonial UN resolutions. For example they thought it necessary to point out that it is lawful to assist the peoples in their struggle to exercise the right to self-determination, that national liberation wars are legitimate, and that it is unlawful to take repressive measures against peoples seeking to exercise their right to self-determination.

The first major clash took place over the question of whether to give first a definition of the peoples' right to self-determination and then set out the ensuing duties of states or, on the contrary, to define that right through the duties of states. The discussion was a fundamental one because the Western countries wanted to limit the principle as much as possible and even to make its formulation quite toothless and safe for imperialism and the colonialists.

If the peoples' right to self-determination were to be inferred from states' undertakings, that would mean subordinating the principle to other principles, thereby making its subject—a people—subordinate to a subject of other principles—a state—that is, as it were, separate and apart from it. The end result would be that the authority of a



state does not stem from the people but that a people is dependent on the powers that be. Furthermore, the forementioned UN General Assembly resolution 1815 (XVIII), which recognises not only the state but the people too as the subject of international law, would be made pointless.

The Western delegates concealed their aims by reasoning that the future Declaration supposedly concerned only the principles of inter-state relations and that states' undertakings among themselves should consequently be considered in connection with or in relation to the given right of a people.

It was correctly pointed out to them that, as is the usual practice in codification, the right itself and its content should first be defined and then the ensuing undertakings formulated.

Cooperation between socialist and non-aligned states forced the Western powers to drop many of their positions.

Eventually, although various parts of the formulation of the principle of the peoples' right to self-determination and the entire Declaration were adopted by the "package" method, the document sets out this principle from the positions of progressive defence of the peoples' interests:

"5. The Principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. By virtue of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, all peoples have the right freely to determine, without external interference, their political status and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, and every State has the duty to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

"Every State has the duty to promote, through joint and separate action, realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, and to render assistance to the United Nations in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter regarding the implementation of the principle, in order:

- (a) To promote friendly relations and cooperation among States; and
- (b) To bring a speedy end to colonialism, having due regard to the freely expressed will of the peoples con-

cerned; and bearing in mind that subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a violation of the principle, as well as a denial of fundamental human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter.

“Every State has the duty to promote through joint and separate action universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter.

“The establishment of a sovereign and independent state, the free association or integration with an independent State or the emergence into any other political status freely determined by a people constitute modes of implementing the right of self-determination by that people.

“Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples referred to above in the elaboration of the present principle of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence. In their actions against, and resistance to, such forcible action in pursuit of the exercise of their right to self-determination, such peoples are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

“The territory of a colony or other Non-Self-Governing Territory has, under the Charter, a status separate and distinct from the territory of the State administering it; and such separate and distinct status under the Charter shall exist until the people of the colony or Non-Self-Governing Territory have exercised their right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter, and particularly its purposes and principles.

“Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States conducting themselves in compliance with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as described above and thus possessed of a government representing the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction as to race, creed or colour.

“Every State shall refrain from any action aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territo-

rial integrity of any other state or country.”<sup>1</sup>

A stubborn struggle also raged around other principles of the Declaration.

These examples of the movement’s role in international law-making are additional proof of the non-aligned countries’ greater and growing vigorous collective impact on the development of international law.

<sup>1</sup> *UN Resolution 2625 (XXV)*, 24 October 1970.

## Conclusion

The non-aligned movement is ever more confidently acting as an influential force of our day. With its great potential, it has been able positively to affect the international situation throughout an entire historical epoch. As a factor of world politics, non-alignment, far from exhausting its potential, is steadily tending toward further development, as evidenced by the movement's membership growth from conference to conference. Recent events have shown clearly that more and more countries and peoples are moving away from imperialism's aggressive policy and seeking new ways to strengthen their freedom and independence in alliance with the other progressive forces of today.

Bringing together over 100 countries as full-fledged members and 20-odd states as observers, the movement has become a powerful factor in the effort to attain international peace and security. It is only natural, therefore, that neutralist countries have been taking an increasing interest in and expressing willingness to cooperate with it. The same is true of numerous social and political organisations that see it as an alternative to the imperialist policy of oppression and aggression. Not only the national liberation movements fighting for freedom and an end to imperialist domination but also many progressive political parties, including communist parties, see the non-aligned movement as an effective instrument of the struggle for peace, international security, and peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts, and against the arms race and a heightening of international tension.

The movement's strength and viability lie in the fact that, as a part of the progressive forces of today, it expresses the vital interests of the bulk of countries and peoples that have emerged from colonial slavery and embarked on a

path of independent development. The non-aligned movement is an effective and yet flexible form of unifying young national states, which are home to most of humanity, to uphold their political and achieve economic independence, and to resolve the complicated social, political and other problems facing them.

Experience shows that the mainspring of the movement's development will continue to be its adherence to the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid as the principal enemies that have thrown the development of young national states centuries back. The emergent countries see imperialism and colonialism not only as the enemies of yesterday that kept them enslaved for centuries but as enemies of today which want to maintain their domination by imposing new forms of exploitation and oppression called neo-colonialism. For that reason they legitimately insist on a reorganisation of international economic relations and establishment of a new economic order on a just, democratic basis. This is an extremely difficult endeavour requiring a long and stubborn struggle whose outcome will be determined by the general alignment of social and political forces worldwide, the maturity of the non-aligned movement, and the solidity of its alliance with the democratic and progressive forces.

It goes without saying that, having emerged in definite historical conditions, the non-aligned movement is going to evolve as the world situation and the world correlation of class and political forces change. In this sense it is transient in character but it will operate as an active social and political force until the causes and circumstances which brought it into being are removed.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that imperialism, as the non-aligned movement's main antagonist, will, using even more sophisticated methods and brute force where necessary, do everything possible to split the movement, tear countries of a capitalist orientation away from it and include them in their military and political strategy, isolate and expel from the movement countries with progressive regimes that lean toward world socialism, erode the anti-imperialist and anti-military base of the entire movement, and place it at the service of its own goals and interests.

That is why one should not close one's eyes to the fact

that the movement has vulnerable spots and weak aspects. There are many reasons for this: the substantial difference in members' level of socio-economic and political development, and consequently differences in their goals and their approach to burning international problems, varying views on the very character of the movement, and so on. It should be noted that the contradictory tendencies and even clashes of interests between separate groups of countries in the movement are largely determined by the problem of relations with the two social systems, i.e. the degree of one group of countries' political and economic dependence on imperialism and the firm relations which the other group has with world socialism. The clash of the opposing forces naturally affects the policy documents, which bear the stamp of compromises and mutual concessions.

But despite all that, the non-aligned movement has been able to work out fairly flexible and effective forms for the coordination of members' actions and the functioning of its various bodies. The principle of consensus was the only acceptable means of overcoming disagreements and finding mutually-acceptable solutions.

The movement's future successes are guaranteed because, first, its members as a whole, irrespective of their socio-economic system, level of development of the productive forces, size and geographical location, understand that if they want real progress in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism and firmer political and economic independence they have to act as a united organisational force and abide by the fundamental principles and goals of the non-aligned movement; second, the movement's strength lies in its unity of action with all anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces and progressive movements. In fighting for general democratic goals, the non-aligned movement objectively stands on the side of world socialism and is, along with it, striking at the political, economic and ideological positions of imperialism since imperialism is not only hostile to socialism but is also an implacable enemy of freedom and independence of the peoples that have embarked on a path of independent development. History has shown conclusively that any departure from the basic goals of non-alignment and any pulling away from its principal allies weakens the movement, slows down its development, and leads to

political stagnation. Fidel Castro said that any attempt to bring non-aligned countries into conflict with the socialist camp was profoundly counterrevolutionary and served only the interests of imperialism.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries consider the non-aligned movement a part of the world anti-imperialist front, an important factor favouring peace and social progress and improvement of the international situation.

As Mikhail Gorbachev stated in a message to Robert Mugabe, Chairman of the movement's eighth conference: "The Soviet Union is against the non-aligned movement being considered in the light of the East-West confrontation and fully understands non-aligned countries' desire not to participate in military blocs, to pursue an independent policy, and determine their own path of development. The development of friendship and cooperation with those states has always been an important direction of Soviet foreign policy."

The Harare conference issued a disarmament appeal addressed to the Soviet and American leaders urging them "to take immediate steps to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war", and conclude a disarmament agreement, including "an early agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

That is why the policy of cooperation between the two most important international political forces of our day—world socialism and the non-aligned movement—is a historically correct direction of the fight against imperialism and reaction and for peace and international security.

## REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Общественно-политическая литература

Движение неприсоединения

Под редакцией И. И. Коваленко и Р. А. Тузмухамедова

*На английском языке*

Редактор русского текста К о р н е е в а И.

Контрольный редактор Ш а ф р а н о в В.

Художник Г у б а н о в Г.

Художественный редактор Р а з у м о в А.

Технический редактор Д у б р о в и н а Л.

ИБ № 16138

Сдано в набор 26.03.87. Подписано в печать с РМ 04.02.88. Формат 84x108 1/32. Бумага офсетная № 1. Гарнитура Баскервиль. Печать офсетная. Условн. печ. л. 14,7. Усл. кр.-отт. 30. Уч.-изд. л. 16,17. Тираж 5980 экз. Заказ № 606. Цена 1 р. 50 к. Изд. № 42962.

Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени издательство "Прогресс" Государственного комитета СССР по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной торговли. 119847, ГСП, Москва, Г-21, Zubovskiy bulvar, 17.

Отпечатано на Можайском полиграфкомбинате Союзполиграфпрома при Государственном комитете СССР по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной торговли.

Можайск, 143200, ул. Мира, 93.



## ERRATA

### SHOULD READ

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Page 67, line 6 from bottom | holds sixth place compared with the USA's 15 NATO allies, its  |
| Page 142, line 19 from top  | only partial ones, but the Western powers, backed              |
| Page 186, line 14 from top  | has never aimed to draw any newly-independent country into the |
| Pages 203, 263              | SENTO to read CENTO  |
| Page 237, line 4 from top   | Asian Nations (ASEAN) was formed in 1967 with head-            |





